THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XX.—APRIL, 1895.—No. 78.

THE CORRELATION OF ORDER AND JURISDICTION.

ANGLICANS are feeling somewhat confused. Lord Plunket, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, has just introduced his own personal jurisdiction into (what Anglicans would call) the national Church of Spain, while, at the same time, the Archbishop of Canterbury speaks of the Catholic Church in Great Britain as "the Italian mission," and the Archbishop of York speaks of Cardinal Vaughan as "an Italian cardinal who calls himself Archbishop of Westminster." Here is an evident bewilderment as to jurisdiction. If the theory of national churches, in the Anglican sense, is to be vindicated by any sort of consistency, Lord Plunket cannot justify his innovation; but we have not heard that either of the English archbishops has convicted him of trying to make a schism, nor so much even as reproached him for his egotism. And yet the Archbishop of Canterbury must be supposed to look unfavorably on Lord Plunket's "Irish mission" in Spain, while the Archbishop of York must be presumed to be skeptical as to the jurisdiction of Lord Plunket's nominee. How are we to get straight upon these confusions? High Church Anglicans are vexed with Lord Plunket, and yet cannot see their way to reprimand him. They know that their theory of national churches is purely political, not spiritual; the *jus divinum* having become absorbed into the *jus civile;* and, though they would be glad to find an escape out of the anomaly, they are bound hand and foot by actual facts. Is it not possible to aid them in an extrication? Cardinal Vaughan has just told them that they have not a true priesthood, and Pope Leo XIII. has just earnestly invited them to return to the unity of the Catholic Church; but this question

of "jurisdiction" does not engage the Anglican mind as being really inclusive of all difficulties. If we can show that the bishops of the Church of England have not so much as a semblance of jurisdiction, we shall be showing at the same time that the Anglican claim to be Catholic is totally devoid of foundation.

I.

St. Thomas says: "Spiritual power is twofold, one sacramental, the other jurisdictional." Suarez says: "The pontifical power is, as it were, the primal example of all spiritual power of jurisdiction, for no one will deny that that is a true power of active jurisdiction; nay, in that order is the highest that can exist in mere man." He adds that "the proper power of jurisdiction is granted to other bishops by election or simple concession, not by consecration . . . . the episcopal power being but a certain participation of the papal power." Order, therefore, does not confer jurisdiction. The Anglican Bishop Horseley said well: "The power of order is properly a capacity of exercising the power of jurisdiction conferred by a competent authority." This is a lucid way of saying that a man irregularly ordained, albeit he may be in possession of true order, is not commissioned to use these spiritual powers as a representative of Catholic authority. "Orders may be seized upon in defiance of authority, but they carry with them no valid jurisdiction" is as obvious as it is a time-honored truism. If it were not a truism, then any bishop might intrude on any diocese; any bishop might transfer his personal allegiance to any bishop whom he might happen to prefer; and any layman might question the spiritual authority of any priest or bishop who was set over him. Even in temporal matters it is manifest that jurisdiction must dominate all kinds of social order. Queen Victoria has lawful authority in her own dominions; but she cannot exercise that lawful authority in America. A judge cannot pass sentence outside the defined sphere within which his jurisdiction has been limited. Professional men cannot practice till they have received their diplomas; nor can soldiers or sailors take the command unless they have been duly commissioned. The principle of jurisdiction is recognized by all men equally as to things spiritual and temporal; only High Churchmen will insist that spiritual jurisdiction may be derived from an authority which is not spiritual.

The controversy then being limited within the one simple enquiry, "What constitutes a competent authority?" we ought not to experience much difficulty. It would be strange, indeed, if there existed much difficulty, seeing that the answer must determine the alternative, whether we are Catholics or schismatics. If we may say so, it seems unlikely that Almighty God would have

left us in doubt as to a first principle. Schism being the separating from lawful authority and schism being, as Anglicans affirm, a "deadly sin," we might naturally expect that the authority which can judge of schism should be as conspicuous as is the sun at noonday. A soldier has no doubt as to who is his commander-in-chief; nor can a spiritual soldier be possibly less assured as to who is his supreme living authority. We assert, then, that the source of jurisdiction must be so assured as to admit of no controversy. And this is the truth we would demonstrate.

II.

What constitutes a competent authority? In this question authority is assumed; there is only the question as to competency. Now jurisdiction has been defined as "the moral power of ruling those who are subject to you." But this moral power is twofold: (1) the power to make laws and to enforce them in regard to external government or discipline; (2) the power to pass sentence, spiritually, on one who has been made subject to your jurisdiction. But whence did this moral power proceed? "Feed my sheep" was the divine origin of jurisdiction. It had nothing to do with order, episcopal or sacerdotal; it was exclusively the grant of jurisdiction. And the successors of St. Peter, so soon as they are elected, receive power to exercise jurisdiction, that is, acts of external jurisdiction; for, as Suarez says, "Acts of pontifical jurisdiction, as such, are not acts of order or consecration, nor flow from it; so neither are acts of episcopal jurisdiction." Thus, "*ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia*," as St. Ambrose so tersely expressed it, is the postulate of all true jurisdiction. We go back to the fountain, to the source. Without a fountain, without a source, there can be no continuance. And just as, in the Catholic Church, we know the origin of jurisdiction, and therefore know whence and how it is now derived, so outside the Catholic Church there can be no true jurisdiction, because the fountain, the source, has been repudiated.

But can it be shown, historically, that this first principle of jurisdiction has been recognized always by all Catholics? It will be better, in attempting to answer this question, that we limit ourselves solely to English history; for otherwise the inquiry would lead us to great lengths, and scores of books have rendered the effort unnecessary. Besides, it is exclusively with reference to the Anglican establishment that we desire to consider this question, our whole point being the correlation or congruity of the Anglican order and jurisdiction.

Now no one denies that Pope St. Gregory the Great *claimed* jurisdiction over England. But our Ritualist friends are very quick

with the rejoinder, "True, but he had no *right* to claim it." Our answer is, How was it possible he should claim it unless (1) he knew that he had the right, and unless (2) he knew that all men would concede it? The objection that the British, who were at enmity with the Saxons, refused to receive an emissary through the Saxons, and refused also, as Venerable Bede says, in their "unspeakable wickedness," to preach the Gospel to their still pagan enemies, does not in any way affect the fact that all Christian peoples acknowledged the divine supremacy of the Pope. And this supremacy being acknowledged, as even the Ritualists do not deny, a long while before the mission of St. Augustine—acknowledged by the whole Christian world—one of two things must necessarily follow: (1) either the claim of St. Gregory was a just claim, or (2) the whole of Christendom had for a long while been deceived. But how was such a deception even possible? How was it possible that in such very early centuries—a goodly period of twelve hundred years ago—the whole Catholic Church should have got so utterly wrong upon the primary question of authority as to permit a bishop of Rome to claim the supreme power and not only to permit but to acquiesce? King Henry VIII. admirably disposed of this hypothesis in his famous "Answer" to the apostate Martin Luther. In his "Defence of the Seven Sacraments" he said to Martin Luther (only three years before the time when the charms of Ann Boleyn bewitched the king's soul and intelligence): "When Luther so impudently asserts, and this against his former declaration, that the Pope has no kind of power over the Catholic Church, no, not so much as human, but that he has by sheer force usurped the sovereignty, I greatly wonder how he should expect his readers to be either so credulous or dull as either to believe that a priest without any weapon or company to defend him, as doubtless he was before he became possessed of that which Luther says he has usurped, could ever have hoped to gain, without any right or title, such empire over so many bishops, his equals, in so many different and distant nations; or that all people should believe that all cities, kingdoms, provinces, had been so reckless of their own affairs, rights, and liberties, as to give to a strange priest an amount of power over them, such as he could have hardly dared to hope for." It is more than three centuries since Henry VIII. wrote so sensibly; and it was a thousand years earlier still when Pope St. Gregory wrote to St. Augustine: "Your Brotherhood will, moreover, have subject to you not only the bishops whom you or the Bishop of York may ordain but *all* the bishops of Britain by authority of our God and Lord Jesus Christ." Again: "Over the bishops of Gaul we give you no authority . . . . but with respect to the bishops

of Britain we commit them all to your Brotherhood." And if it be asked by whose authority was the primacy of England affixed forever to the See of Canterbury, the answer is, by the authority of Pope Boniface, who, writing to St. Justus, successor of St. Augustine, said: "We confirm and command that the metropolitan See of all Britain be forever after in the See of Canterbury." Now to assume that such an exercise of authority—done in the face of the whole of Christendom—was, as Protestants express it, "a usurpation," is to assume (1) that "all peoples, cities, kingdoms, provinces had been reckless of their own affairs," as Henry VIII. wrote with admirable sarcasm; (2) that, within three centuries of the Church's issuing from the Catacombs, the whole of Christendom had become deluded upon the most important of all questions, the question of the supreme teaching authority; and that therefore (3) our Divine Lord had broken His promises to His Church almost immediately upon its emerging from its infancy; permitting the gates of hell to prevail against it, not only as to one truth or two truths, but as to the only possible security for all truths—the living authority which defines them.

The *doctrine* and the *fact* of the papal jurisdiction, throughout the whole history of the Catholic Church in England, were never dissociated for a moment. As to the doctrine, we have not space to quote Lanfranc, Venerable Bede, Alcuin, St. Anselm, St. Aldhelm, St. Wilfrid, St. Thomas, Archbishop Bradwardine, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and hosts of other doctors and theologians. Let us limit our quotations to two authorities, both of whom every Anglican should respect. First, Fisher, Bishop of Rochester (A.D., 1535), being commanded to acknowledge the primacy of the apostate Henry VIII., spoke his mind at full length in the Upper House of Convocation; and the following are brief extracts from his speech: "To *thee* will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven! Now, my lords, can we say unto the King, *Tibi*, to *thee* will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven? If you say yes, where is your warrant? If you say no, you have answered yourselves that you cannot put such keys into such hands. . . . . Again, my lords, can any of us say unto the King, *pasce oves?* . . . . And it is not a few ministers of an island that must constitute a head over the universe; or, at least, by such example we must allow as many heads over the Church as there are sovereign powers, and then what will become of the supremacy? . . . . The Council of Constantinople did acknowledge Pope Damasus . . . . the Council of Ephesus did acknowledge Pope Celestin . . . . the Council of Chalcedon did acknowledge Pope Leo . . . . and now shall we acknowledge another head, or one head to be in England and another in Rome? . . . . And shall we cause our king

to be the head of the Church, which all good kings abhorred the very least thought thereof, and so many wicked kings have been plagued for so doing? . . . . If this thing be, farewell to all unity with Christendom; for as that blessed martyr St. Cyprian saith: 'All unity depends upon the authority of that Holy See, as upon the authority of Peter's successors.'"

Our second witness shall be Heath, Archbishop of York. And our reason for choosing him is that the present Anglican Archbishop of York has just spoken of Cardinal Vaughan as "an Italian cardinal who calls himself Archbishop of Westminster." Now, Archbishop Heath lived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and when the Act of Supremacy was proposed, declaring the Queen to be Supreme Governor of the Church of England, Heath (and all the bishops were of one mind with him) protested against such enormity in these words: "By the forsaking and fleeing from the See of Rome, we must first forsake and flee from all general councils; secondly, all canonical and ecclesiastical law; thirdly, the judgment of all Christian princes; fourthly, the unity of Christ's Church; and, by falling out of Peter's ship, hazard ourselves to be drowned in the waters of schism, sects, divisions." Now one reflection only shall be made upon these testimonies, for it is a reflection that no Anglican cares to make. It is manifest that the bishops in the days of Henry VIII., and the bishops in the days of Queen Elizabeth, must have known a great deal more of the history of the Church in England—history both as to doctrine and as to fact—than the Protestant-born Ritualists of the present day. And the same remark is true of all the martyrs—of such men, for example, as Sir Thomas More, the most accomplished English gentleman of his day—who died for their fidelity to the old faith. *They* had not been fed on the Thirty-Nine Articles, nor nourished on the Form of Common Prayer; their whole hearts and souls were Catholic from their baptism, from their first confession, from their first Communion; and their whole intellects were rarified by their legitimate inheritance of the whole of the uncorrupted Catholic faith. *They* knew what was "Catholic" better than do the Ritualists, and, knowing it, they died rather than protestantize; died rather than call themselves High Churchmen or Ritualists, or by some such fantastic insularism as Anglo-Catholics.

III.

We pass now from jurisdiction to order, so that we may be able to associate the two together and show why the Church of England lacks both. It would be wearisome to go over the old ground of the insufficiency of Parker's ordination, of the insufficiency of

the ordinals of King Edward, of the contempt of the Anglican reformers for a sacrificing priesthood or of the total rejection of Catholic doctrine and practice affirmed by the Articles and Prayer Book. Let us confine ourselves to what we may call the *moral* arguments—more powerful, perhaps, than even the arguments which are derived either from history or from theology.

Let it be granted that Anglican orders are valid. Now, what would be the consequence of this postulate?

It would follow that, for three hundred years, the Church of England possessed a priesthood without knowing it. Preaching Sunday after Sunday against the Catholic priesthood, reviling the Mass and speaking evil of the Confessional, administering a "communion" (at very long intervals) which was declared to be *not* the Catholic communion but only a commemoration of the Lord's Supper, allowing the consecrated crumbs to be scattered about the communion rails (an accident inseparable from the Anglican practice) and permitting the parish clerk to treat the remnants on the paten, and also the remnants in the chalice, with no more respect than he would show at his own breakfast table, using a "table" instead of an "altar" for the ministration, and being most careful to warn the communicants that there was no Real Presence, but that our Lord was received "by faith only" and "in the heart"; the Anglican clergy have for three centuries declared that they were *not* priests, but only ministers or parsons or reverend gentlemen.

Let us go deeper still. The "character" and the "office" of a true priest must of necessity have a good deal in common. We all know what we mean by a Catholic priest—a man set apart by his character quite as much as he is by his office. He is unmarried. He is dissociated from social trammel and conventionalism. The very reproach which has been cast against him by Englishmen (for three centuries) is that he is not a domestic or family man. He has been reviled for no other reason than that he has lived above nature and presumed to look upon his priesthood as supernatural. It is this "priesthood" which has been his reproach; this very priesthood which Anglicans now assure us belongs equally to Protestants and Catholics. And as to the "character" of the Anglican clergy—we use the word character in priestly sense and without the slightest reference to personal merit—we may certainly say that anything less supernatural it would be simply impossible to imagine. The average schoolboy transformed into the undergraduate, the average undergraduate transformed into the curate, the average curate transformed into the married man, the average married man transformed into the dignitary—into the apron'd and gaiter'd dean or bishop, opulent

in spirit, aristocratic in pretension, connubial in habit and comfortable in home; an Anglican clergyman, from his cradle to his grave, has been almost everything in the world except a priest, spite of his many natural virtues or good points. In short, if we place, side by side, the two types, the English Catholic priest since the Reformation and the English Protestant clergyman since the Reformation, we find the two "characters" as exactly opposite as the two "offices," and yet the two characters always consistent with their offices, never confused nor intermixed for a single moment.

This is a moral argument of such surprising significance that it needs only natural instinct to apprehend it. But now to go further. This new theory of the identity of the Anglican ministry with the priesthood of the Catholic Roman Church involves the following startling contradictions: The *same* priesthood has taught that there are seven sacraments, and yet that five out of the seven are not sacraments, but only "a corrupt following of the apostles." The *same* priesthood has taught that baptism both is and is not the spiritual regeneration of the soul, that confirmation is both the sacrament of the Holy Ghost and yet a renewal only of the vows made by God-parents, that an integral confession in the sacrament of penance is necessary for the forgiveness of mortal sins; while yet the sacrament of penance is such a shocking impropriety that all Anglican bishops, rectors and curates have warned their flocks to shun it as "a soul-destroying error," and have consequently never once thought of administering it; that divine worship means the sacrifice of the Mass, while yet the same sacrifice is an idolatrous invention, "a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit"; that transubstantiation is a divine fact, while yet it is a Popish figment and superstition; that holy order is (mainly) the conferring of the two powers of consecrating and of absolving from sin, while yet the consecrated elements remain unchanged, nor has any priest the power to absolve; that marriage is both a Christian sacrament and a union which is dissoluble by civil judges; that extreme unction is both a Christian sacrament and yet such a "corrupt following of the Apostles" that no Anglican has ever remembered its existence; and, finally, the *same* priesthood has believed of the Reformation that it was the greatest outbreak of the powers of darkness which Christendom has known for fifteen centuries—resulting in an "abomination of desolation" such as neither in doctrine nor in practice could be surpassed—while yet, at the same time, it was "the blessed Reformation," the substituting of the pure gospel for corrupt popery and the new birth of liberty and enlightenment.

All this, and a good deal more, must follow from the theory

that the Catholic and Anglican orders are identical, a maze of contradictions which, on the method of *quia absurdum*, would prove the fact of non-identity to demonstration.

IV.

Our point being the correlation of order and jurisdiction, we have tried to show that the Anglican bishops and clergy must be devoid of both the one and the other. But we should wish now to work the two points together; to show that the want of order is fatal to jurisdiction, while the want of jurisdiction, though not fatal to order, is fatal to the due exercise of order.

Let us take an example in recent history. The new Anglican See of Liverpool was founded by act of Parliament. Its first bishop, Dr. Ryle, was appointed by Lord Beaconsfield. The See, therefore, was created by the civil power, and the jurisdiction of the bishop was created by a temporal peer—the author of "Coningsby" and "Lothair." Now, assuming Dr. Ryle to have been a true bishop, was he true Bishop of Liverpool? If so, then the Catholic bishop was an intruder. This narrows the inquiry to the simple question, Has the English Parliament or the Pope the greater right of creating a See, and has the Prime Minister or the Pope the greater right of jurisdiction—the greater right that is, of conferring jurisdiction? If we accept the Anglican theory, then the plenitude of the apostolic authority must reside, not in a spiritual, but in a civil power. This would be equally absurd with contending that the plenitude of the civil authority must reside not in a king but in a pontiff. Every one knows that a king or a parliament or a prime minister—or a score of all three put together—cannot possess a shred of apostolic authority. If they did, then might Nero have claimed the jurisdiction over the Christian Church of the Rome of his day or the Sultan of Turkey might now appoint Christian bishops within the limits of his restricted autonomy. But to escape from the dilemma some Anglicans affirm that jurisdiction is derived *from* the See, leaving the question unanswered, From what authority does the See itself derive its lawful tenure or existence? Catholics have no difficulty in answering such questions, their position being logical and unassailable. A See itself can only derive its right of being a See from the authority of the pontiff who created it; the bishop of any See can only derive his jurisdiction from the authority of the pontiff who approved him; while, as to the pontiff himself, his jurisdiction is derived neither mediately nor immediately from any human authority nor from his See nor from the will of the Catholic Church, but immediately from our Lord Jesus Christ. Hence it follows that the jurisdiction of all bishops, save the pontiff, is limited

within a prescribed region or area; the Archbishop of Westminster having no power to grant a mission to any ecclesiastical person outside Westminster. Indeed, it would seem that the Archbishop of Canterbury is the only archbishop or primate who claims a universality of jurisdiction, sending bishops to Gibraltar or Corea, with an assumption of the plenitude of apostolicity. And it is just here that the lack of order and the lack of jurisdiction meet in their most striking combination. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, having no order, cannot possess any jurisdiction, and, conversely having no jurisdiction, the order which he (hypothetically) confers is void of all legitimate exercise.

But we would say a word more on the *history* of this anomaly. The origin of the Anglican jurisdiction, like the origin of the Anglican order, was the accident of Queen Elizabeth's illegitimacy. Cardinal Pole had, in Queen Mary's reign, absolved the nation from schism and heresy, and restored it to the communion of the Church. But Queen Elizabeth, compelled by her illegitimacy, tore the nation once more from Catholic unity; risking her own soul, and the souls of her subjects, in order that she might reign forty years. So reluctant was the nation to return to schism, that a packed parliament could only secure a small majority of three in favor of the apostate oath of royal supremacy; all the bishops, the universities, the whole body of Catholic clergy, and all the laity who dared to speak their mind, protesting against the hideous impiety. Thus it was by act of parliament alone that the ancient faith, the ancient hierarchy, the ancient liturgy were swept away, and the present doctrines, rites, and ceremonies of the new Church were established as parliamentarily sound. It is just here that jurisdiction and holy order seem to contend for the mastery in confusion. Six of Elizabeth's theologians being consulted as to the validity of the new orders, gave it as their opinion that "in a case of such urgent necessity the queen possessed the power of supplying every defect through the plenitude of her ecclesiastical authority as head of the Church." In other words, these Protestant theologians maintained the perfectly original theory that true jurisdiction being wanting for the new order, a false jurisdiction must be pronounced true. The new order, they said, is certainly equivocal; we admit that it is not in the least like Catholic order; but, as we have thrown over the pontiff's jurisdiction, which could alone decide the question authoritatively, one alternative alone remains to us: we must affirm that the queen's jurisdiction is *more* divine than the pontiff's jurisdiction; so that the queen can henceforth teach the pontiff, rebuke the pontiff, even anathematize him, "in the plenitude of her ecclesiastical authority as head of the Church." And if it be replied, "Yes, this was the attitude of

Elizabeth, but so far only as the Church of England was concerned," our answer is: You first create a new national church, in the teeth of the opposition of the whole nation, episcopal, sacerdotal, and lay—excepting only the small crowd of powerful worldlings who had become enriched by the spoils of the Catholic Church—and having done this, you say that the new jurisdiction remained as restricted as the new church. This may be perfectly true as a political fact, but it is none the less an apostacy and an absurdity. It is an apostacy because you make the fount of all spiritual jurisdiction to be insular, civil, and lay; and it is an absurdity because you affirm of the lesser that it can rule, and ought to rule, the greater. You take from God the things which are God's, and you give them to any turbulent Cæsar. You make a civil and a lay power to sit in judgment on a divine sacrament (for not even Henry VIII., before or after his excommunication, denied that holy order was a divine sacrament), and you give to an island-queen the power to "supply all deficiencies in the acts done by them" (her bishops), "or in the person or state, or faculty of any of them; such being the necessity of the case and the urgency of the time"; a power which never was claimed by any pontiff, and which every pontiff would have repudiated as an impiety. Thus you invert every process of common sense. You admit that it must belong to a divinely appointed jurisdiction to decide on faith, worship, and holy order, and yet affirm that it belongs to a queen or to a parliament to *create* that same divine jurisdiction whenever the "urgency of the time or the necessity of the case" seems to call for such spasmodic creation. "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are God's" is the new Anglican reading of the divine command. To pontifically define what is divine jurisdiction, and then to more than pontifically create it, was that Anglican assumption which accompanied the creation of a new church, a new faith, a new religion. Well might Montalembert say: "The Church of England was one of the most awful forms of sin and pride that has ever appeared in the world." All other forms of heresy had been based on the assumption that divine authority had misinterpreted a divine truth; but Elizabethanism was based on the assumption that the civil power could *create* divine authority, and could then license this divine authority to teach whatever truths were most agreeable to its tastes or its ease.

V.

Archbishop Parker, the first Protestant archbishop of Canterbury, used to "take a pleasure," as Strype tells us in Parker's Life, "sometimes to recollect how he was consecrated, and that he was the first of all the archbishops of Canterbury that came

into that See without any spot or stain of popish superstition and vain ceremonies required of all before him, without any bull or approbation from the Pope of Rome." Sixty-nine archbishops of Canterbury had exercised their jurisdiction as primates by the authority of him who sent St. Augustine; but the appointment, the approbation of Parker, as well as his episcopal consecration, were all of them devoid of all authority, being contrary to all precedent, ritual and canon law, which had been venerated in the old English Church. No wonder that the Catholic bishops in the time of Queen Elizabeth turned their backs on such a travesty of Christianity. They refused to subscribe the oath of supremacy, which affirmed that the queen was "the only supreme governor in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes" and that "by this present parliament all such jurisdictions, *i.e.*, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority had heretofore been" became henceforth "united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm," with a great deal more of the same kind of profanity. Whereas, in all Catholic time, the Pope's jurisdiction had included authority to redress heresies, to institute or confirm bishops-elect and to receive appeals from the spiritual courts, henceforth, by parliamentary acts, the crown became the source of all spiritual jurisdiction and the judge of the purity of all doctrines. In other words, the Pope had no spiritual jurisdiction; but the crown had all spiritual jurisdiction. The crown became to the Church what it was to the State, and to deny that it had become so was *ipso facto* to incur excommunication. Perhaps the story of Parker's pretended consecration has furnished the most practical illustration of the worthlessness of this spurious jurisdiction. Parker's four consecrators—excommunicated regulars—who had no more jurisdiction, ecclesiastically speaking, than they had belief in the sacrament of holy order, were supposed, by the queen's patent, to confer the same jurisdiction as St. Gregory had conferred on St. Augustine. This is about as irrational as would be the pretension of four culprits to confer jurisdiction on a judge. Putting aside the fact of Parker's consecrators being excommunicated and of their being—as the Anglican rector, Dr. Lee, does not hesitate to call all the reformers, "unredeemed villains"—they had no more power to create an archbishop than a deserter would have to create a general. Probably the utmost reach of burlesque that ever was known in sacred things was the consecration of Parker by unfrocked monks, unless, indeed, the jurisdiction which he derived from such imposition be not a more wonderful stretch of comedy or of imagination.

We need not pursue further a distasteful subject, and yet it is necessary for a moment to dwell upon the hazards which this new

theory of priesthood involves. Some of the Ritualist clergy now hear confessions. Apart from the extreme danger of a Protestantly educated clergyman, who has had no preparation for such an office, being made the confidant of the confessions of penitents, and apart from the moral certainty that such an unprepared clergyman has no orders which would confer such priestly powers, there remains the fact that the absence of jurisdiction must render his absolution null and void. To quote the words of Father Breen, O.S.B., in his "Letter to a Friend:" "It is a first principle in theology, admitted by all theologians, that to confer or receive lawfully any sacrament, in ordinary cases, besides valid order ecclesiastical jurisdiction is also necessary and that its absence renders the administration of the sacrament of penance not only unlawful but even invalid." Here, then, exists more than a sufficient reason why Anglicans should not "go to confession" to Anglicans. It is not only a case of a layman confessing to a layman and of a confessor being as little fitted for his office as the penitent is ill at ease in his confidence; there is the further consideration that, jurisdiction being wanting, absolution cannot be granted by the confessor. What a waste, then, of the best intentions, the best efforts! Admirable, truly sincere and often heroic as are these struggles to get back to a Catholic sacrament, we can only hope that their merit may obtain the supreme grace of a speedy conversion to the Catholic Church.

A. F. Marshall.

INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

"Sic Vos Non Vobis."

(THIRD ARTICLE.[1])

THE sachems of the Pequots, of the Narragansetts, of the Wampanoags or Pokanokets, of the Massachusetts, and of the Pawtuckets, were the five political rulers dominating all other Indian nations living upon what now constitutes New England's main lands and the islands included within her present boundaries. This was before the advent of the white race.

The Pequots, the most numerous and perhaps the most warlike of these Indian powers, possessed the territory since known as Connecticut, having their chief canton where the picturesque city of New London now stands. They dominated the contiguous nations, and on the shores of the Connecticut River and parts of Long Island.

The Narragansetts, second in importance, had their chief cantons on the shores of Narragansett Bay and Canonicut Island.

They ruled the nations of the bays, the islands, and of the inland regions from the eastern border of the Pequots' domain, including Rhode Island, Block Island, and parts of Long Island.

The Wampanoags, third in importance, had their domain and cantons east and northwest of the Narragansetts; they controlled the nations inhabiting Nantuckett, Martha's Vineyard, Nawsett, Mannamoyk, Sawkattuckett, and other minor tribes.

The Massachusetts, fourth in importance, were the original lords of the soil constituting the State which perpetuates their name and identifies their memory with some of the most important events in North American history.

They were a numerous and great people, living northward of the Wampanoags, and their principal cantons, which were the first to be encroached upon by the Puritan colonists, were clustered on the shores of Massachusetts Bay.

They dominated the Weechagaskas, Neponsitts, Punkapaogs, Nonantums, Nashaways, and some tribes of the Nipmucks. They were hostile to the Narragansetts, and allied with the Pawkunnawkutts, who were south of them, and with the Pawtucketts, who lived on the northeast of their border.

The Pawtucketts, fifth in relative standing, occupied the country north and northeast of the Massachusetts, and dominated the

[1] See the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW for October, 1893, vol. xviii., 698, and for July, 1894, vol. xix., 545.

Pennakooks, Agawomes, Naamkeeks, Pascatawayes, Accomintas, and tribes of other nations. The Pawtucketts' domain was the next, after that of the Massachusetts, to be encroached upon and subsequently occupied by the Puritan colonists.[1]

All these Indian nations used a general language having local dialects.

The five sachems of the Pequots, Narragansetts, Wampanoags, Massachusetts, and Pawtucketts, held sway over their subordinate nations by the power of their warriors and by traditionary right of control; they were rarely at peace with each other. Had they united their forces into an armed confederacy, such as was the Iroquoian at a corresponding time, and united in opposing the white intruders on their respective domains, it is doubtful if the English Puritans could have established the permanent settlements they had succeeded in making. Without such union they were unable single-handed to resist the power of the whites, who crushed one after another of these sachems; the leading and most ambitious, and the most numerous of the combinations, the Pequots, being the first to experience the fate reserved for all, and were conquered and dismembered as early as 1637.

During the interval of peace ensuing, was commenced the missionary effort to convert the Massachusetts Indians. This missionary work became coincident with the inception of the "Algonquian Bibliography," so far as this related to publications by English authors during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These prints were more or less connected with religious work in behalf of the Indians; which beginning, as stated, soon after the conquest of the Pequot sachem, and interrupted by subsequent wars, was ended when there were no longer any Indian tribes left on New England soil; when in fact the New England nations had become obliterated.

But the attention of the general reader, and of the historical student in particular is directed to the fact that these Puritan missions were contemporary, first, with the Catholic missions of Huronia, and second, with the glorious and chivalric, if not romantic, crusade of the Jesuit fathers in the Iroquoian cantons, who, at the peril of their lives, bore the standard of the Cross, which they erected successively in every canton of the warriors of the Iroquoian Confederacy, in the "Country of the Lakes" of New York, from the Mohawk and Hudson Rivers to Lake Erie.

Probably no periods in the history of the North American Indians are more interesting in relation to their welfare and to their subsequent fate. For the immediate descendants of these races were destined to fall under English control.

[1] The Indian nomenclature is that of General Gookin, as quoted by Mr. Pilling in his *Algonquian Bibliography*, p. 176.

The one great character, and the most prominent actor, in the history of the failure of the efforts to convert and to civilize the Indian people ruled by the five great aboriginal sachems of New England; the man whose name stands out in bold relief in Puritan history as the apostle of mercy and of charity to the red men whose territory had been reft from them by the Puritan colonists—the name of this man is John Eliot.

He was born in Herfordshire, England, in 1604, graduated at Cambridge in 1622, and received orders in the Church of England, but became a dissenter and emigrated to Boston in 1631, where he was married the following year.

He was soon after accepted, ordained as a Puritan minister and assigned to the small pastorate of Roxbury, near Boston, where he remained during the entire course of his earthly career.

His interest in the welfare of the New England Indians was first made conspicuous by one of his sermons at Roxbury, in which he denounced the commissioners of the colony, who were the ruling power, for sharp practice on their part to the prejudice of the Pequot nation. This was in 1634.

For this he incurred the displeasure of the colonial magistrates and he was compelled to make a public apology. It is on record as an acknowledgment of his ability, that in 1639, he, in conjunction with Rev. Thomas Welde and Rev. Richard Mather, were appointed to prepare a new version of the Psalms of David in English metre, which work was printed and has since been generally known as the "Bay Psalm Book." This was the first book printed in the English-American colonies. Extending his interest in the native Indian to a more practical method, he instructed an intelligent young Pequot, living in Dorchester, in the English rudiments, and when satisfied with the mental capacity of his copper-hued student, he made him his own tutor in the study of the Indian dialects, with the general use of which he soon became familiar. In 1646 he commenced his missionary work by preaching to the Indians, in the vicinity of Boston, in their local dialect, and in the following year he made regular visits to the chief cantons of the five dominant Indian powers. Like nearly all Indian missionary labor, his initial experience was neither agreeable or satisfactory, and, moreover, it was not exempt from toil and danger. This was the beginning of the Puritan missions, as they may be called, in New England. An account of this work and a description of the field of its operations was sent to England, and in 1647 a society was chartered in London for its encouragement and support, officially "for the propagation of the gospel to the Indians of New England."

It was this London propaganda which supplied the means for subsequent missionary work in New England by sending each

year funds and material to the commissioners of the colony. John Eliot was its apostle.

In the meantime the converted Indians were withdrawn from their respective homes and grouped in a settlement at Nonatum, in the vicinity of Boston; and in 1650 the Christian Indian town of Natic was founded, where all the converts were gathered and where the heads of families were assigned land, on which they built homes and cultivated the soil for their support; a tribal form of government was established among them.

After nine years of probation this Natic community were deemed worthy and formally admitted to the Puritan fold. They were then permitted to form a church organization.

Natic became the headquarters of Eliot. He preached here regularly, established an Indian school and from its pupils he selected and prepared young Indian adepts to aid him in the missionary field.

Similar Indian convert communities were subsequently organized in New England under the auspices of Eliot and his zealous co-laborers, Mayhew, Bourne and Cotton.

The aid extended by the London propaganda enabled these missionaries to work among the Indians with partial success, but the war with Philip in 1675 utterly demoralized these efforts to civilize them.

The colonists became so insanely maddened against them, that a red man, whether a Christian convert or a Pagan, became the object of their deadly hatred and frequently met death at their hands at sight.

Even the peace-loving converts at Natic, who, for a quarter of a century, had been permitted to enjoy Christian fellowship in the Puritan fold, experienced this hatred to such an extent that to save them from being slaughtered, Eliot was obliged to tear them hastily from their homes and to provide a refuge for them near Boston.[1]

A worse fate met the unfortunate converts who had been grouped in other Christian communities. Despite the protests of Eliot, Mayhew, Bourne, Cotton and their co-workers, the converted Indians were driven from these settlements and compelled to seek a refuge in the forest and to undergo the persecutions of their Pagan enemies.

The lot of these unfortunates became a sad one; they were hunted out of their abodes by Puritan soldiers, and such as escaped death at their hands experienced it with torture from their savage persecutors.

After the downfall of Philip, Natic and some other convert settlements were repopulated and missionary work was resumed;

[1] On Deer Island, in Boston harbor.

but the native New Englanders had become suspicious of the sincerity of the white man; results were discouraging, little progress was made, although many native preachers and exhorters aided the missionaries.

The New England Indians were the first of their race on North American soil to experience the effects of their contiguity to the Anglo-Saxon race.

Their doom had been sealed. Their utter extinction had become only a question of time; the presence of a Christian Indian on the soil of his ancestors was disagreeable to the Puritan, and as occasion required, the wild tribes of the forest were chased and slaughtered without mercy. Natic, which had been the solace of Eliot's philanthropic heart, languished and decayed.

Its Indian population steadily diminished and its founder who had built so much upon its future, was destined to witness its partial extinction. Eliot had an Indian preacher ordained to succeed him; his successor continued to labor until 1716, when Natic, last of the converted Indian settlements on New England soil, ceased to exist as such, and so far as its Indian population was concerned, became a thing of the past.

Meantime, there had been no lack of funds for missionary work in New England; the London propaganda had rather increased their liberal contributions, which they sent each year to the Commissioners of the Colonies; whether these functionaries were in sympathy with Eliot and his confréres, who had increased in number and efficiency, is a question.

But by the aid of these funds Eliot was enabled to compile and have printed in the Indian language at Cambridge, Mass., the religious, scriptural and philological works which remain a monument to his memory as a philanthropist and a scholar.

A notice of these works will appear in the chronological series arranged by Mr. Pilling.

The earliest English print described in the "Algonquian Bibliography," has a fac-simile of the title page; it is by Captain John Smith, of Virginia:

A Map of Virginia.
With a Descripti-
on of the Country, the
Commodities, People, Gover-
ment and Religion.
Written by Captaine Smith, sometimes Go-
vernour of the Countrey. (sic).
etc.
At Oxford.

Printed by Joseph Barnes, 1612. Small quarto, pp. 110. Copies were seen in the British Museum, Harvard aud Lenox libraries.[1]

[1] A fine copy of this work was sold at the Murphy sale for $180.

The next in chronological order is:

"Good nevves from New England: A true Relation of things very remarkable at the Plantation of Plimoth in Nevv England. Shewing the wondrous providence and goodness of God in their preservation and continuance, being delivered from many apparent deaths and dangers," etc. By "Edward Winslow,[1] London, 1624, printed for William Bladen and John Bellamie; to be sold at their shops at the Bible in Pauls Church Yard, and at the 3 Golden Lyons in Corn Hill, near the Royal Exchange." Small quarto, pp. 130.

Following the above are fac-similes of the beautiful designed title pages of Captain John Smith's—The

Generall Historie
of
Virginia, New England and the Summer Isles, with the names of the Adventurers, Planters and Governours, from their first beginning in 1584 to this present, 1624, etc.
London.
Printed for Michael Sparkes. Folio pp. 250. The second title page is for the edition of the same work of 1626. The designs are exquisite and contain medallions of Elizabeth, King James, and Prince Charles, coats of arms, etc., finely engraved. Copies of these editions were seen in the Brown, Congressional and Lenox libraries.[2]

Rosier's voyage, etc., 1625, is noted.

"New Englands Prospect," etc. With fac-simile of title page. London 1634, follows. Quarto, pp. 98. This work contains about 265 words in the Massachusetts Indian dialect and English; the names of the sachems, rivers, and places, etc., in the same dialect, by William Wood. Later editions of this work printed in 1635 and 1639 are also described. Next in order follows a fac-simile of the title page of

"A Key unto the
LANGUAGE OF AMERICA.
Or an help to the language of the natives in that part of America called New England. Together with brief observations of the customs, manners and worships, etc., of the aforesaid natives in Peace and Warre, in Life and Death, etc."
By Roger Williams,
Of Providence in New England.
London, 1643. 24mo., pp. 200.

Mr. Pilling minutely describes the matter contained in each chapter. Copies were seen in Brown, Congressional, Harvard, Lenox, and other libraries.[3] Later editions and reprints are also described.

"The Day Breaking, if not the Sun rising of the gospell with

[1] The copy of this work in the Lenox library cost $350.
[2] One of the five copies of this edition in the Lenox Library cost $1800.
[3] A copy of this edition was sold at the Murphy sale for $77.

the Indians in New England," etc. By Rev. Thomas Shepherd, London, 1647. Small quarto, pp. 25. Several reprints of this work in this country are described.

We have now reached the notice of the first of Mr. Eliot's Indian works, viz.:

"A primer or catechism in the Massachusetts Indian Language. By John Eliot. Cambridge, 1654: printed by Samuel Green." Mr. Pilling remarks, that it is the earliest printed book in the Massachusetts Indian language of which any record has been found. No copy is known to be extant. Probably 1000 were printed.

A second edition of this primer was printed by Mr. Green in 1662, comprising 1500 copies, not one of which is known to be extant.

A third edition was printed by Marmaduke Johnson in 1669, the only known copy of which is in the library of the University of Edinburgh. It contains 64 leaves, 32mo.

A fac-simile of the title page is given; the upper part in English, followed by

"Composed by J. E."

The lower part is in the Massachusetts Indian language. The English part of the title page reads as follows.

"The Indian Primer"
or
The way of training up our Indian youth in the good knowledge of God, in the knowledge of the Scriptures and in the ability to Reade.

The contents of the copy referred to are minutely described. A fourth and larger edition of this catechism was printed at Cambridge by Samuel Green in 1687. No authentic copy of this edition is extant. "But in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society is a copy of Mr. Eliot's primer in the Massachusetts Indian language, supposed to be unique, which may be a copy of this edition. It is without title, name of place or printer, and also without date, but appears to have been complete in 40 leaves. Size of the leaf, 3½ inches high by 2¾ inches wide." Fac-similes of 4 pages in Indian text are shown.[1]

The assembly's shorter catechism was also printed either before or after the last edition noted above. No copy of this catechism is known to be extant.

In 1655, Mr. Eliot translated and had published the Book of Genesis in the Massachusetts Indian dialect. Cambridge, Mass.: Printed by Samuel Green. But no copy is known to be extant. Neither is there to be found a copy of the Gospel of Matthew, translated and printed the same year. A few psalms in metre,

[1] *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages*, p. 129.

translated and published in 1658, have also disappeared. No copy has been found.

"A Christian Covenanting Confession," a work translated by Mr. Eliot and printed in the Massachusetts Indian dialect by Samuel Green, Cambridge, 166–, is next described from an only known copy in the library of the University of Edinburgh. It is 7 by 5 inches, divided by lines. The text is minutely described and a fac-simile given of 2 of the leaves. The Indian text is on the left of a dividing line and the English on the right. Another edition of the same work was printed about ten years later, and the only copy supposed to be extant is in the Congregational Library at Boston, which is somewhat imperfect. It was Mr. Eliot's greatest desire that the Indians should have access to the Scriptures printed in their native dialect.

No one knew better than he did the time and labor requisite to prepare Scriptural matter for the press. He communicated his anxiety and his intention to commence this work to the propaganda in London, and he was encouraged to undertake a translation of the New Testament. The funds required for its production the propaganda agreed to provide.

The fac-simile of the title page in English, which Mr. Pilling produces, gives us a clear idea of what the original book was like. Its title page is a creditable piece of work for an American press nearly two and a half centuries ago:

"The New
TESTAMENT
of our
LORD AND SAVIOR,
JESUS CHRIST.
Translated into the
INDIAN LANGUAGE
And
Ordered to be printed by the Commissioners of the United Colonies in
NEW ENGLAND
At the charge and with the consent of the
CORPORATION IN ENGLAND
For the Propagation of the Gospel in New England.
Cambridg:[1]
Printed by *Samuel Green* and *Marmaduke Johnson*,
MDCLXI." (1661.)

The translator's name does not appear on the title page, which, when translated into the dialect of the natives, would have confused such of them as were able to read the matter printed after the title.

The testament is dedicated to Charles II. and has 130 printed leaves, small quarto.

[1] A copy of this edition was priced in London in 1884 at $525.

The fac-simile of the title page in the dialect abbreviated reads as follows:

"Wusku
WUTTESTAMENTUM
Nul-Lordumun
JESUS CHRIST
Nuppoquohwuffuaencumun:"

With printers' names and date in English.

Mr. Pilling devotes 4 closely-printed octavo pages to the history of all that connects with this edition and quotes from Dr. John H. Trumbull, Dr. E. B. O'Callaghan, the letters of Eliot, of the commissioners of the colony and of Governor Endicott. In one of the commissioners' letters they write: "In Generall wee haue bin enformed that about 100 of Mr. Elliott's (*sic*) Indians can read in the bible and many others about Plymouths Martin's vinyards and other places," etc. Of the edition of 1661 probably 1000 copies were printed and bound at a cost of £440.

In addition, 40 presentation copies with the Indian and English title and the dedication were bound and sent to the propaganda in London. Those inscribed were for Charles II., Lord Hyde, the Vice-Chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge, the Rev. Joseph Caryl and Rev. Richard Baxter. The disposition of the remaining copies was left to William Ashurst and Richard Hutchinson, officers of the propaganda.

Of the original edition only 16 copies are known to be extant. Of these, 2 only can be claimed to have been among the 1000 copies circulated among the New England Indians; one of them is in the Harvard Library and the other in the Lenox Library. The 14 remaining copies were among those sent to London at the time of publication aud referred to above. Of these, 6 have been purchased by American collectors at a cost of about $700 per copy, and are to be found in American private and collegiate libraries; and 8 are in the English, Scotch and Irish University Libraries, to whom they were originally presented by the London propaganda; and in the British Museum.

In the meantime, Mr. Eliot had not been idle. In 1663, he had put in press the Indian Bible, which connects his name with North American history. The Indian title page reads as follows:

"Mamusse wunneetupanatamwe up biblum God naneeswe nukkone testament kah wonk Wuskutestament. Ne quoshkinnumuk nashpe Wuttinneumoh Christ noh asoowesit John Eliot." Cambridge, etc., 1663.

It resembles the title page of the Testament of 1661.

There were bound with the Bible intended for circulation among the Indians: Mr. Eliot's translations of the "Psalms of David in Metre" and the "Rules for Christian Living"—the

whole edition amounting to about 1050 copies, of which 40 were sent to the officers of the London propaganda for presentation; it cost the latter association about £800 in the aggregate for this edition. A few copies were presented to prominent American parties and about 1000 copies remaining were circulated among the Indians of New England. Fac-similes are given of the first pages of the Psalms and of the rules. The whole Bible, with these additions, numbered 594 printed leaves in quarto.

Most of the copies of this edition known to be extant are to be found among the 40 originally sent to London.

In the subsequent wars with Philip this entire edition, save a few copies, was probably destroyed, and these latter are the only ones that can be positively traced to Indian ownership.

It is not fair to allege that the thousands of Testaments, Bibles, catechisms, hymn books and homilies which had been printed in the Indian language and circulated among the New England tribes were destroyed by Philip's warriors; it is quite probable that the intense hatred of the Puritan soldiers for the unfortunate red man, whether Pagan or Christian, was vented to some extent on the belongings of the latter.

Of the 1663 edition of Mr. Eliot's Indian Bible, Mr. Pilling claims there are 39 copies extant; these he describes in numerical order, giving their origin, history and present ownership.

Twenty-nine copies are known to be in collegiate and reference libraries in New York, New England and in the collections of wealthy bibliophiles. Of these 16 have been traced back to contemporaneous New England scholars and 13 to English sources.[1] Of the 10 copies remaining, 2 are in Holland, 1 each in the Duke of Devonshire's and Earl Spencer's libraries, and the others are in the English, Irish and Scotch Universities and in the British Museum.

In the description of these 39 copies Mr. Pilling has covered 10 closely-printed octavo pages of his bibliography.

Some of the copies existing are imperfect, others bound up with fragmentary parts of different editions. Some of these copies cost their American owners, according to condition, from $200 to $1500, while for the fine copy owned by Mr. Charles H. Kalbfleisch, of New York City, $2900 was paid, which is about three times its weight in standard gold coin. This copy was originally in the library of the Earl of Hardwicke.

In 1680 a later edition of the Testament was printed, and in 1685 the whole Bible was revised and reprinted, as also other translations into Indian of religious books.

[1] The copy in the Brown University, Providence, R. I., was originally owned by Roger Williams.

These books were produced on new type, better paper, and they were all substantially bound, the whole expense to the propaganda being about £1000.

Fac-similes of the Indian title pages of the Bible and of the first pages of the Psalms and "rules" are given. The literal translation of the title page of the Bible, as given by Mr. Pilling is:

"The whole holy his Bible God, both Old Testament and also New Testament. This turned by the servant of Christ, who is called John Eliot. Second time amended impression, Cambridge, etc., 1685."

This translation is from Dr. Trumbull's "Origin and Early Progress of Indian Missions in New England."

Mr. Pilling describes numerically in 7 classes 55 copies of this issue known to be extant in America and Europe, giving a minute description of each, with its history and ownership. More than one-third are imperfect or mutilated. A number of copies owned by American bibliophiles have been rebound and restored at considerable expense by Samuel Bedford, of London, a specialist in such work.

The copies extant, however rare, are not considered so valuable as those of the original edition; 27 are in American institutions, 11 in European libraries, 1 in the Congressional library, and 16 in American collections of wealthy bibliophiles in the United States.

The cost of those owned by the latter has been from $200 to $1000. Of the copies owned in this country, 27, including the imperfect copies, are traced to contemporaneous New England Puritan owners, and 28, which are in the best condition, were among the 40 originally sent the London propaganda in 1685. Time may develop other copies, says Mr. Pilling, whose description of those known to be extant occupies 11 closely printed octavo pages. It should be mentioned that of the edition of 1663, but one copy could be traced back to Indian ownership, and of the later edition 6 copies were found to have been owned by New England Indians during the early decades of the eighteenth century.

In 1663 Mr. Eliot wrote Mr. Richard Baxter, London, for permission to translate his "Call to the Unconverted" into the Massachusetts Indian dialect, which had been printed in London in 1657. Mr. Baxter consented, and the translation was printed by Green and Johnson, Cambridge, 1664. No copy of this edition is extant. It was reprinted in 1688 and a fac-simile of the title page in the Indian dialect is given by Mr. Pilling.[1]

[1] The copy of this little work in the library of Yale College cost $135.

Bayly's "Practice of Piety" was next translated and published in 1665, and a later edition in 1685. Copies of these Indian works are quite rare; the few that are known to be extant are described.[1]

About the same time, at the suggestion of Hon. Robert Boyle, director of the London propaganda, Mr. Eliot commenced the compilation of an Indian grammar.

In this work he was assisted by his sons, John and Joseph. The fac-simile of the title page given by Mr. Pilling reads:

"The Indian Grammar begun; or, an Essay to bring the Indian Language into rules, For the Help of such as desire to Learn the same, for the furtherance of the Gospel among them by John Eliot." Scripture text follows. "Cambridge. Printed by Marmaduke Johnson, 1666."[2]

Small quarto, pp. 66. According to Dr. Trumbull, the Massachusetts Indian language was also spoken with some differences of dialect by the Wampanoags, the Narragansetts, the Niantics, the Indians of Martha's Vineyard, the Montauks, etc. Probably 500 copies were printed. Mr. Eliot was not satisfied with this grammar. Copies of this work are rare. In 1670 Mr. Eliot organized at Natic a class in logic and theology, to whom he lectured once a fortnight. The object of these lectures was to prepare the members of the class to study to advantage the Scriptures.

In connection with this work he published in 1672 "The Logic Primere" in English and Indian; fac-similes of 4 pages 32mo. are given. One thousand copies were printed and ultimately circulated among the Indians.

The only copy that Mr. Pilling could trace is in the British Museum.

In 1689, Mr. Eliot translated and had published another devotional book for the Indians, "The Sincere Convert," originally by Thomas Shepard, London, 1641. A fac-simile of the title-page is given by Mr. Pilling.[3]

Several other works in connection with his missionary labors were published in the English language by Mr. Eliot in America and in England.

"In the latter part of October, 1659, there was printed in London a book entitled "The Christian Commonwealth," which had been written by Mr. Eliot nine or ten years before.

After the restoration of Charles II., in 1660, the governor and council of Massachusetts colony considered that the republican

[1] A copy of this work in Yale Library cost $205.

[2] A copy of this grammar was sold in London in 1859 for $227.

[3] The copy of this work in the Yale Library cost $100.

sentiments of this publication, if allowed to pass unnoticed and unreproved, might be represented to their disadvantage.

The book was therefore formally condemned and suppressed on the 18th of March, and in the following May a retraction, signed by Mr. Eliot, was made public.[1]

"The Sincere Convert." was the last of Mr. Eliot's publications. He died at Roxbury on the 21st of May, 1690, in the 86th year of his age.

Among the contemporaries of Mr. Eliot in the missionary field was Rev. Abraham Pierson, who published "Some Helps for the Indians," 8°, p. 67, in English and Indian. Cambridge: Samuel Green, 1658.

A larger edition of this work was printed by Mr. Simmons, in London, 1659.

Fac-similes of the title pages of both editions are given from copies in the British Museum.

A letter from William Penn, descriptive of the people of Pennsylvania, colonists, and Indians, and a full description of the latter, their language, customs, manners, habitations, etc., folio p. 10, London, 1683, is next described, as also three subsequent editions of the same in English, two in Dutch, one in German, one in Scandinavian and one in French. Several editions of Mr. Penn's subsequent works containing linguistic matter are also described, showing that he was a fair student of the Indian dialects of his time. After Mr. Eliot's time, there came on the editorial platform of Indian missionary work a school of Puritan ministers whose books have a place in the Algonquian bibliography, and whom Mr. Pilling mentions in their chronological order.

Rev. Grindal Rawson, whose work:

"Spiritual Milk for Babes, Drawn from the Breasts of Both Testaments for the Nourishment of their Souls," originally written by John Cotton and now turned into Indian language for the benefit of Indian children, by Grindal Rawson, minister of the gospel among the Indians, p. 44, Cambridge, 1691

is described with a fac-simile of the title pages in English and Indian.[2]

A confession of faith, 1699, in Indian, by the same author, is also described.

Of the same school was Samuel Danforth, whose "Greatest Sinners Called and Encouraged," in English and Indian, 8°, pp. 164, printed in Boston, 1698, is noted with fac-simile. "The Woful Effects of Drunkness," by the same author, in Indian and

---

[1] *Bibliography of the Algonquian Language*, p. 180.

[2] The copy of *Milk for Babes* in the Yale College Library cost $85.

English, printed in Boston, 1710, is also noted with fac-simile of title page.[1]

Rev. Cotton Mather is next noted: "An Epistle to the Christian Indians," etc., in the Indian language, Boston, 1700, pp. 14, 16°, and a similar work in 1706.

"Family Religion Excited and Assisted," in double verse, English and Indian, 16°, pp. 20, Boston, 1714, with fac-similes Indian and English. "India Christiana," a discourse to the Commissioners, etc., on Indian missions, by the same author, and published in English, Indian and Latin, pp. 94, 16°, Boston, 1721. Fac-similes are given of title pages and of page 52.[2]

Mr. Pilling describes an earlier work of Mr. Mather: "A Monitor for Communicants," of which no copy is extant, and remarks: Mr. Mather is best known, probably, by his numerous published writings, numbering over 400 separate books and tracts. His library was the largest of any in America at that time, and his learning was more varied and extensive than that of any of his contemporaries in New England.

His piety, talents and industry were considered wonderful; but, notwithstanding these attainments, it is evident, as one of his biographers remarks, "that his judgment was not equal to his other faculties." He was weak, credulous, superstitious, vain and conceited; and his passions, which were naturally strong and violent, were unduly excited by disappointed ambition. According to his own account, Mr. Mather was able to write in seven languages. It seems that he had given some attention to the Massachusetts Indian language as early as 1688.[3] "Dr. Trumbull," continues Mr. Pilling, "in 'The Memorial History of Boston,' criticizes Mather's knowledge of the language."

"The devils,"[4] he says, "who found Mather's Indian too hard for them were not without excuse. Judging from the specimens he printed, he had not mastered the rudiments of the grammar, and could not construct an Indian sentence idiomatically. It is not certain how much of these translations were his own work, and how much was obtained from incompetent interpreters."

Dr. Trumbull is, in all that relates to Indian bibliography, to the construction and relationship of American Indian languages, admitted to be one of the greatest authorities. To what extent his remarks may apply to less distinguished New England writers is a question for serious consideration. One can imagine the dismay

---

[1] The printing plant of Green & Johnson was moved from Cambridge to Boston prior to 1700.

[2] The copy of this work in the Lenox Library cost $300 in 1890.

[3] *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages*, p. 314–5.

[4] The Pagan Indians.

of the good Indians as well as that of "the devils" in making sense out of defective Indian text.

A very queer little work published in the Indian language was translated: "The Hatchets to Hew Down the Tree of Sin, which Bears the Fruit of Death," etc. Boston, 1705, 8°, pp. 16.

The author of this work is unknown.

"Of this tract," writes Dr. Trumbull, "I have seen only two copies, one in the Antiquarian Society Library; the other is now in the Lenox Library, New York."[1]

As an example of the glowing accounts of America offered to the consideration of the people of England, towards the close of the seventeenth century, may be cited from p. 486 of the work under review:

"Gabriel Thomas:[2] An Historical and Geographical Account of the province and country of Pennsylvania; and of West New Jersey in America, the Sweetness of the situation, the Richness of the Soil, the Wholesomness of the Air, the Navigable Rivers, and others, the prodigious Encrease of Corn, the flourishing Condition of the City of Philadelphia, with the stately Buildings, and other Improvements there. The Strange Creatures, as Birds, Beasts, Fishes, and Fowls, with the several sorts of Minerals, Purging Waters, and Stones, lately discovered. The Natives, Aborogmes (*sic*), their Language, Religion, Laws and Customs; The first Planters, the Dutch, Sweeds, and English, with the number of its Inhabitants; As also a touch upon George Keith's New Religion, in his second Change since he left the Quakers. With a map, etc." London. Printed for, and sold by A. Baldwin, at the Oxon Arms in Warwick Lane, 1698.

What gives this work a place in this bibliography is the linguistic examples of the dialects of the Delawares or the Lenâpés. Frankfort and Leipsic editions are also noted.

Between Penn and Thomas, the Quaker colony was fairly well advertised in Europe.

Robert Beverley's "History and Present state of Virginia," etc., London, 1705, treats of "the learning and language of the Indians, the Algonkine," etc.

No community of Indians in New England, probably, received more missionary care than the tribes inhabiting Martha's Vineyard. This island, with others, was granted by Lord Stirling to Thomas Mayhew in 1641, who began a settlement at Edgartown, in 1642.[3]

At that time there were probably, of the native population, 1500 souls. In 1720 there were but 800 of all ages on the island.

One of the most zealous of the disciples of John Eliot was the Rev. Thomas Mayhew, son of the grantee, who was the first minister of the first English church on the island.

---

[1] The *Hatchets* in the Lenox Library cost $40.

[2] Gabriel Thomas had been a resident of Pennsylvania for fifteen years.

[3] He died on the island in 1681, aged ninety-two.

He began to preach to the Indians in 1643, and soon after converted Hiacoomes, probably a chief, who was instructed and became his assistant, and who subsequently was ordained a minister.

Rev. Thomas Mayhew translated and had printed some devotional tracts in the local dialect.

In 1657 he sailed for England with one of his Indian preachers, and was lost at sea.

The Rev. Experience Mayhew, grandson of the above, was born on the island in 1673. His father, Rev. John Mayhew, was an Indian preacher. Rev. Experience, in his own account, says: "I learnt the Indian Language by rote, as I did my mother tongue, and not by Studying the rules of it, as the Lattin (*sic*) Tongue is commonly Learned." He began to preach to the Indians in 1694.

His earliest work in the Indian dialect, described by Mr. Pilling, who gives fac-similes of the English and Indian title-pages, was "A discourse concerning the Institution and observation of the Lord's day," Boston, 1707, 16°, p. 36.[1] "The Massachusetts psalter; or psalms of David, with the gospel according to John." In columns of Indian and English, 16°, 201 leaves, was printed in Boston in 1709. Fac-similes of the title-pages in Indian and English are given.[2] Dr. Trumbull says of this work: "Mayhew's version of the Psalms and Gospel of John is founded upon Eliot's: but every verse underwent revision, and scarcely one remains without some alteration. The spelling differs considerably from that of Eliot and others, who had learned the language among the Indians of the mainland. In exploring 'the latitudes and corners' of Indian Grammar, Mr. Mayhew probably went further than Eliot had gone, and the fact that his work went through the hands of 'James,' the Indian printer, gives it additional value as a monument of the language."[3]

We are indebted to Mr. Pilling for some authentic information regarding the Mohegan or Stockbridge Indians. In the early part of the eighteenth century "the Mohegans, commonly called the River Indians, were the largest tribe of any near the English settlements in New England. They dwelt mostly along the eastern border of New York, partly in the northwest corner of Connecticut, and in the southwest part of Massachusetts, on Housatunnuk River." In 1735 John Sergeant, who was born in Newark, New Jersey, in 1710, and who was graduated at Yale College in

[1] This edition was priced in London at $250 by Quaritch.

[2] A copy of this work sold in New York for $135.

[3] "James" was probably the first of his race who became a printer. He was a Natic Indian, and learned his trade from Samuel Green in Cambridge. "He had worked on both editions of the Indian Bible." Trumbull, quoted by Mr. Pilling, p. 348.

1729, was ordained to the ministry, and sent as a missionary to Housatunnuk, with a salary of £150. The tribe numbered only fifty families. Mr. Sergeant applied himself to the study of the dialect of the tribe, which he soon mastered. In 1736, land being granted by Massachusetts "above the mountain," a township of six miles square was laid out and called Stockbridge, and to this location the Mohegans were removed; hence, the origin of the name this tribe has since been familiarly known by, the "Stockbridge Indians." The new town became the seat of Mr. Sergeant's mission. He preached to them in their own dialect, and so well, that the Indians were wont to say: "Our minister speaks our language better than we ourselves can do." Mr. Sergeant succeeded in converting most of the tribe. He also extended his labors to other localities. In 1747 he wrote that he had gathered the scattered families around him; instead of their "Bark Hutts," they own seventeen "English Houses," fifteen of which they had built themselves at their own cost. In 1749 he contracted a malignant fever, and died at the age of thirty-nine years.

The Indian population had, in the meantime, increased to 218 persons, 182 of whom had been baptized, and his church had 42 native communicants.

Mr. Pilling has given fac-similes of two pages in Indian of "morning prayer" and "prayer before sermon," which Mr. Sergeant had composed and had printed for the use of his flock. The history of this tribe subsequently may be briefly stated. For two years they were without a pastor; several succeeded until 1775, when John Sergeant, son of the first missionary, became the successor in his father's work, and was an adept in the use of the native dialect. He so continued until 1785, when the whole tribe removed to land which the Oneida nation in New York had given them, where they built the village of New Stockbridge. Mr. Sergeant subsequently followed and resumed his pastorate, which lasted thirty-eight years. The church was built by the Missionary Society, and would accommodate 500 persons. The mission was supported by the Scotch Society propaganda in Scotland, by Harvard College, and by the American Indian Missionary Society jointly.

In 1795 "The Assembly's Shorter Catechism" was published in the Mohegan dialect.

The lands of the Oneida Indians had been rapidly passing from their control, and in 1818 one portion of the New Stockbridge people removed to Indiana, and in 1822 another large party joined the principal portion of the Oneida nation, who that year emigrated to Wisconsin and occupied a reservation of about 70,000 acres on Fox River, near Green Bay."

"The Indiane Primer or the first Book. By which children may know truly to read the Indian Language, and milk for Babes. Boston: Printed by B. Green, 1720;" is the literal translation of a work in Indian and English, 12mo., pp. 168, and was probably prepared for the press by Experience Mayhew, the name of the author not appearing.

Fac-similes of the title pages and of pages 19—19 in Indian on one and English on the other, are given.

An edition of the same work of about ten years later date with fac-simile follows. The contents are curious as they appear in English.[1]

"The history of the colony of Nova Cassaria or New Jersey, by Samuel Smith," Burlington in New Jersey, 1765. 8vo., pp. 573, is noted as containing examples of the New Jersey Indians.[2]

The travels of Captain Jonathan Carver, 1766–1768, through the interior parts of North America, London, 1778, pp. 544, 8vo.; an edition of 1779 and another of 1781, are noted.

There is also an edition of the same work printed in Dublin, 1779; two Paris editions in 1784; a Philadelphia edition of 1784, and another of 1789; a Portsmouth, New Hampshire, edition of 1794; a Dutch edition printed at Leyden in 1796; another Philadelphia edition of 1796; and a Boston edition of 1797. Nineteenth century editions follow. Next to the Baron La Hontan's, Captain Carver's descriptive account of this country seems to have had the largest number of editions of any similar work during the same century. Besides those noted above, there are others. It has a place in the Algonquian bibliography on account of the description given of the Indian nations whom Carver states he had visited. The dissertations of Rev. Jonathan Edwards on the languages of the Muhhekanew and of the Mohegan and other Indian nations, printed in a series of tracts, the first of which appeared at New Haven, Connecticut, 1788, and which were reprinted in London—are described by Mr. Pilling.

A work similar to that of Captain Carver, is, "Voyages and travels of an Indian interpreter and trader describing the manners and customs of the North American Indians," etc.; examples of Chippewa, Iroquois, Mohegan, Shawnee and Esquimeaux dialects, etc.; by John Long. London, 1791, pp. 295. Quarto. Very little dependence can be placed on the linguistic parts of travellers' narratives, such as have been described.

John Quinney, an educated Mohegan and who was an assistant

---

[1] A copy of the latter edition in the original leather binding and clean, is in the Lenox Library. It cost $230.

[2] A copy of this edition was sold in New York for $125. The prices paid for the respective works as stated, are according to Mr. Pilling.

of Rev. John Sergeant, the elder, at the Stockbridge mission, translated and had printed at Stockbridge, "The Assembly's Catechism," 1795—fac-similes of the title page and of the first page are given; subsequently he translated and published "The Assembly's Shorter Catechism," both in the Mohegan dialect.

Benjamin Smith Barton, M.D., is also noted in reference to his dissertations on the Indian languages, Philadelphia, 1797.

The eighteenth century closes with a notice of "Essay of a Delaware, Indian and English spelling book, for the use of the schools of the Christian Indians on Muskingum River. By David Zeisberger, missionary among the Western Indians. Philadelphia, printed by Henry Miller, 1776," pp. 113; 16mo., with a fac-simile of the title page.

Mr. Pilling devotes five closely printed octavo pages to Zeisberger's religious books, printed in the Delaware language, the later editions extending from 1803 to 1847. Rev. Mr. Zeisberger was one of the most devoted Moravian missionaries of the eighteenth century. He was born in Moravia in 1721, and died at Goshen, Ohio, in 1808. He was sent to America in 1740 by the Moravian Church, and was attached in a subordinate capacity to the Creek mission in Georgia. Thence he was sent to Pennsylvania and became a student of the Moravian Indian School at Bethlehem, where he was instructed in the Delaware and Iroquoian languages. He was ordained and appointed to the missionary service in 1743. He had then acquired a knowledge of the languages of prominent Indian nations. His work was widely extended and his converted tribes were generally known as the Moravian Indians.

The principal scenes of his labors were on the Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan frontiers, latterly in Western Canada, from whence he retired with his converts to Goshen, Ohio, in 1798, where, as stated, he died.

His many adventures and escapes from death on the frontiers form a marvelous history and his memory is respected whereever known in the Western States.

Mr. Pilling, in his exhaustive "Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages," has been quite liberal in his notes of the works of the New England missionaries from John Eliot, to what may be called the second generation of these missionaries, who succeeded to Mr. Eliot's work. These notes cover 182 closely printed octavo columns, or 91 pages; while 67 fac-similes illustrate the printed matter, making in the aggregate about 160 pages and leaves, while the last page of the text is 575, covering a period extending from 1609 to 1891, or 282 years of Algonquian history, with which this bibliography connects.

Writers in sympathy with the people of the Iroquoian Confed-

eracy, of whom Lewis Henry Morgan of Rochester, New York, was conspicuous, admit that the most interesting period in the history of the five Nations of the League, was the fifty years or more, comprising the respective missions of the seventeenth century; while the Christianizing results of these missions on the laws and customs of the Iroquoian people were never eradicated.

The New England missions were, as stated, contemporary with the Huronia and Iroquoian missions, although the perils and loss of life attending the latter, were such as were never endured in the former.

The general reader should remember that the Puritan ministers whose names appear in connection with missionary work in New England, however distinguished some of those may have been, were comparatively few in proportion to all the Puritan ministry at a corresponding time; there is good reason to believe that neither the New England people or their ministers, had much sympathy with the work of John Eliot or of his successors. It is apparent however, that this period in the history of the unfortunate New England Indian Nations, was the most interesting since the advent of the white men upon their soil.

We have endeavored in the brief space permitted us, to place before the reader a fair illustration of the outlines of the work accomplished by the Puritan missionaries, as it is our intention to inquire why the work of such good men has produced such barren results; although it is beyond contradiction that the Indians of New England were susceptible of Christian influence and readily accepted the rigid code their teachers prescribed for them.

During the first half of the seventeenth century, as we have stated, five sachems governed all the Indian nations within the present boundaries of New England. They numbered thirty-two and comprised the Accominta, Agawome, portions of Long Island, Massachusetts, Mohegan, Montauk, Munsee, Naamkeep, Narragansett, Nashaway, Natic, Naugatuck, Nehethway, Neponset, Niantic, Nipmuck, Nonantum, Norridgewock, Pampticough, Pamunkey, Paskatawayo, Pawkunnawkut, Pawtucket, Pennakook, Pequot, Plymouth (so called), Pokanoket, Punkapaog, Unquachog, Wampanoag, Wapanoc and Weechagaska.[1]

The languages and dialects of nearly all these nations are noted in the Algonquian bibliography, so that there is nothing shadowy about the fact of their having had an existence on New England soil; while most of the people of these nations probably had been more or less influenced by missionary teaching, and many communities among them had been admitted into the Puritan fold,

[1] The nomenclature of these Indian nations is given according to James Constantine Pilling.

having distinct organizations, and, in many cases, these Indian flocks had for their shepherds ministers or teachers of their own nation or race.

What has become of these thirty-six nations of American Indians whom the Puritans found living upon the soil when they made their first settlements in New England?

What has become of the Christian Indian communities which the Puritan missionaries had converted during the seventeenth and part of the eighteenth centuries?

These are serious questions; but, unfortunately, there is but one answer to them.

With the exception of the Mohegan tribes at Stockbridge, who removed to Oneida county, New York, in 1784—and, perhaps, there may be other unimportant exceptions—these nations have become extinct.

Their descendents are not to be found among the people of the expatriated nations west of the Mississippi nor anywhere else in the western country nor anywhere, in fact, on American soil.

If, by chance, there exists a small number claiming descent from any of these nations, they are no longer American Indians; a few drops of aboriginal blood is all that remains; the rest comes from negro slaves or degraded whites; the color of the Indian has disappeared and they have long since forgotten the use or meaning of an Indian dialect.

It is a singular fact that among of the few copies extant of the Bible, hymn-books, catechisms, prayer-books and homilies, which were printed in the languages of the New England Indians and circulated among them during the fifty years comprising the Puritan missionary period of the seventeenth century, not a single copy can be found in the possession of a descendent of the Indians among whom they were distributed during the period mentioned.

The years of toil, of patient, monotonous labor, necessarily given by John Eliot for the translation and production of his Indian Bibles, proves for all time his philanthropic zeal for the welfare of his Indian contemporaries; and each one of his Bibles existing at the present day, treasured so highly as they are, is, in fact, a monumental memorial of his good work in the Indians' behalf.

But it is sad to reflect upon the fact that no other result remains from the creation and distribution of Mr. Eliot's Bibles than to illustrate the gigantic failure of the Puritan missions and to point to the crime of the destruction of the Indian race of New England.

About the time that Mr. Eliot founded Natic the destruction of the fabric of Christianity, which had been reared in Huronia by Catholic missionaries, had become complete. The Iroquoians in-

vaded the Huron cantons in force and the autonomy of the Huron nation was literally wiped out of existence and its tribes carried captives to the Iroquoian cantons, where they were divided among the eight tribes of the league and adopted into the commonwealth; while others fled to the islands and shores of Lakes Erie, Huron and Michigan. Such of the missionaries as escaped in the general slaughter made their way to Quebec, bringing with them about sixty Huron families, the *élite* of their converts.

To provide a home for these Huron Christian exiles the Indian town of Lorette was founded near Quebec. This was at a corresponding period with the settlement of the Indian town of Natic, as stated, in Massachusetts, or about two hundred and fifty years ago.

We have seen how the Indian converts at Natic suffered from Puritan anger during the excitement of the Indian wars. Mr. Eliot, aided by General Gookin, removed them, and after the excitement had subsided brought them back; and subsequently the town became extinct. How about the Huron town of Lorette?

It still remains where it was founded, with its mission church and school. Its population, who are lineal descendants of the exiles from Huronia, numbered 301 souls, but 5 of whom were non-Catholics, in 1892.

During the bright and the dark periods of missionary work by the Jesuit fathers in the Iroquoian cantons at, as stated, a corresponding period with the Puritan missions in New England, it became necessary, from time to time, to protect Christian converts from the malevolence of pagan relatives and from persecutions, which made their lives unsafe and their existence unhappy.

A retreat for Iroquoian Christians was, through providential intervention, provided at Laprarie, on the river St. Lawrence, near Montreal. This retreat has since been generally known as Caughnawaga, and during the seventeenth century it became the refuge of such of the converts as could no longer live in their homes in the romantic regions of the "country of the lakes" of New York, and who, abandoning these sylvan abodes, with all their traditional memories and the last resting places of their kindred generations, came to the Christian Iroquoian town of Laprarie.

Another retreat was founded later on on the St. Lawrence, to which Christian Iroquoian converts came, even in greater numbers than to Caughnawaga. This retreat has since been known as the mission of St. Régis. But while there came to Caughnawaga exiles from all the five nations, those who settled at St. Régis must have been principally Mohawk converts, for the St. Régis Indians of the present day are recognized by the Iroquoian nations as Mohawks, and as such have been admitted into the Iroquoian

confederacy, which has a nominal existence as such only, as a Mohawk nation in place of the seceded tribes of this nation who, for a century or more, have made their homes on the shores of the Grand River valley in the Dominion of Canada.

Let us see if these tribes of this once warlike league of New York, who were won from barbarism by the Jesuits and made Christians during the seventeenth century, have been wiped out of existence, as were the tribes of the New England nations.

The figures I am about to quote are taken from "The Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs" for the year ending December 31, 1892, for the Dominion of Canada. Ottawa, 1893. Octavo, pp. 402, with tables.

According to the reports of the agents of the government, the number of Catholic Iroquoians living on Canadian soil, as shown in detail, was:

At Caughnawaga, ...	1770
At the Lake of the Two Mountains, ...	225
On the Canadian side of St. Régis, ...	1200
Total, ...	3195
If we add the Mohawks living across the Canadian line in the State of New York, of the St. Régis mission, . . .	1030
We have a total of	4225

All of these are Catholics, except, perhaps, a score of unbelievers living on the American side in the St. Régis mission.

Those only who are familiar with the history of the missions in the Iroquoian cantons can appreciate the labors of the scholarly and saintly men who imperilled their lives and endured great privation to win from barbarism the ancestors of these 4225 survivors, who had expatriated themselves to preserve the gift of faith they had acquired at the hands of these venerable missionaries. But who among the descendants of the Puritans will explain why the results of these missions have been so fruitful, while those of the Puritan missions have been so hopelessly barren? More than $10,000, a large sum in those days, was sent out by the London propaganda to print Bibles, hymn books and homilies in the language of the New England Indians, and from their liberal distribution great results were expected.

Every one in New England, from the cobbler to the Governor, could read his Bible, and even dispute about the meaning of some of the doubtful passages in the sacred text. But alas! how few of the Indians whom it was sought to convert were capable of reading an Indian Bible, much less understanding the prolific significations of its text!

While a New England Indian was given such a difficult mental problem, the Jesuit missionary gave his Iroquoian catechumen the rosary beads or a blessed medal and bade him recite the simple prayers, morning and evening, in honor of the Redeemer and His Mother. What nature so dull as not to understand the practical methods of such simple devotion. Fancy the reflections of the warrior as he told the beads of each decade with his dusky-hued fingers, or of the squaw as she gazed upon the face of the Mother of Sorrows on her blessed medal. Which method was most likely to make a Christian out of an uncultivated savage?

But we might go further in our inquiries and ask the descendants of the Puritans to explain how it has come about, that of the 32 Indian nations who once owned the soil of New England, not one remains; while of the 5 nations who occupied the soil of New York at a similar early day, one only, the Cayugas, has been disintegrated, while the others retain their autonomy and continue to increase?[1]

There are some Indian nations in Maine whose names are not included among the 32 referred to above; take, for instance, the Abenaki and the Algonquin.

The former nation and the latter were served by Jesuit missionaries from an early period, to the conquest of Canada, while living on New England soil. One of the later Abenaki missionaries was Sebastian Rasle, S. J., who was brutally butchered by English soldiers at the foot of the mission cross at Norridgewock in 1724, and his body, after being mutilated by the "incensed soldiery," was left unburied. The origin of the Abenaki missions is very remote; for 250 years the people of this nation have been attended by Catholic missionaries. There were living at St. Francis and Becancour, in the Province of Quebec, 450 Abenakis in 1892, but of this number 69 at St. Francis were non-Catholics.

There are more than 2000 Algonquins in the Province of Quebec, nearly all of whom are Catholic. There are 1300 Montagnais Indians in the Saguenay and Lake St. John districts and nearly 400 of other nations may be found in the same Canadian Province. Out of the 1300 Montagnais, 71 only at St. John are reported to be non-Catholic.

The people of these nations were first converted by Catholic missionaries during the later half of the seventeenth century.

---

[1] The Mohawks, Senecas, Onondagas and Oneidas. The Tuscaroras were added to the league of the five nations in 1712. This nation also survives. There are about 5000 of the descendents of these nations at present in the State of New York. About 4000 are non-Catholics, half of whom are Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists, and the other half follow the Iroquoian cult. As stated, 1000 Mohawks at St. Regis are solidly Catholic.

They not only survive but also increase slowly, and they offer a remarkable example of the steadfastness which has characterized their adherence to the faith their forefathers were so fortunate as to acquire.

But probably the most interesting example which can be offered of the faithful adhesion of the people of any one American Indian nation to the Catholic faith is that of the Micmac.

In the Province of Nova Scotia there are 17 government Indian agencies having 2151 Micmac Indians; in fact, there is no other nation in the province but the Micmac, and they are solidly Catholic. In the Province of New Brunswick there are 11 government Indian agencies having 1511 Micmacs with some Amalicites, all solidly Catholic.

In the Province of Prince Edward Island, there are 312 Micmacs, all united in the Catholic faith.

The French Jesuits sought the conversion of the people of this nation as early as 1610. Fathers Enemond Masse and Peter Biard were the apostles, but they did not succeed in landing at Port Royal until 1611. Here we find a nation of Indians, numbering nearly 4000 souls, whose present condition we shall refer to later, who first beheld a Catholic missionary two hundred and eighty-three years ago. We have taken the figures given from the Dominion report mentioned, which shows that in the aggregate of souls given there is not a solitary non-Catholic.

Charles Sargeant, Northeastern Superintendent, Chatham Head, N. B., in his report dated October 14, 1892, speaking of the respective reserves, describes the Eel Ground, Northumberland County: "This is a fine reserve, sloping nicely to the river, and well adapted for farming, yielding fine crops, etc. Their houses are fairly comfortable; they have a neat church and school-house, and the Indians are fairly well to do."

At Burnt Church, in the same county, Mr. Sargeant reports: "This band, on account of location, should be very well off; they can fish nearly all the year round. In the summer season they can catch salmon, bass, mackerel, herring, and codfish, and in the winter they fish for smelt, all of which has a market as soon as caught."

"The land is fairly good, and they raise more or less potatoes, oats, corn, etc.

"There is a fine old church on the reserve, and a neat school-house, with a young lady as teacher."

"The population is about 200. They always celebrate the festival of St. Anne (July 26th) in July, during which time (the octave) all work is ignored."

The report from Big Cove, in Kent County, reads: "This is a

very fine reserve, and, as a rule, the Indians are better individuals than in many other places. The soil is good, and when an effort is made, they raise good crops. A number of them work on the river, running lumber from the mills to the place of shipping. This reserve has the largest population in my superintendency. There is a very nice church here, and I am pleased to know they are anxious to keep it in good order and repair," etc.

James Farrell, agent for the Northern Division, Fredericton, remarks: "In closing, I am pleased to report that the habits and customs of each band are exceptionally good.

"A few occasionally indulge in the use of intoxicants, but, as a rule, seven-eighths of all the Indians are an industrious and thrifty class of people."

In Nova Scotia, Charles E. Beckwith, Indian Agent at Kentville, reports, August 15, 1892: "There is not much change in the Indians of this agency; the greater part of them are hard-working, quiet, and industrious people," etc.

Thomas J. Butler, Indian Agent at Caledonia, Queens County, in the same Province, reports, August 15, 1892: "The majority of the Indians reside at Milton. Those there live in comfortable houses, are clean and tidy in their habits, and obey the sanitary regulations of the department. Very many of them delight in cultivating flower gardens, besides attending to the cultivation of the seed received from the government. Some of them have this year cleared more land in order to put in a larger crop next spring. I am happy to state that I have not heard of one case of drunkenness amongst them during the past year.

"The one or two who, in the past, were addicted to this vice are now reformed men. Those living at Milton, on account of its proximity to Liverpool, a seaport town, are in more danger of temptation than elsewhere, yet they are all sober people. I am glad of this, knowing the sober, industrious Indian makes as good a citizen as his white neighbor."

"The majority of the Indians in Lunenburg County (N. S.) reside on the grant at New Germany, and have splendid soil, fine farms, good houses, large stock, and are a happy and contented people. There is no laziness there; no poverty, no begging. They are as good as their white neighbors, as independent, and as much respected," etc.

Robert McDonald, Indiant Agent at Pictou, N. S., reports, September 1, 1892, of the people in his district: "Sobriety is fast becoming a virtue with them. They seem to realize every day the injury and danger of the habit of drinking."

The whole tribe this year, as usual, gathered at the Indian Island to celebrate the festival of St. Anne, their patron saint.

They have shown a great deal of sincere piety. It is their great desire to have their beautiful little church entirely finished.

They have already spent on it, and the house for the priest, in the vicinity of $2000, the most of which was paid by themselves.

The benefit of gathering to this island once every year is not to be viewed alone from a religious standpoint. The priest or agent can confer with them as a body on matters concerning their temporal welfare, and impress upon them the advantage of adopting the new and improved methods in their various avocations," etc.

Father John C. Chisholm, Indian Agent at St. Peter's, Cape Breton, reports: "I am glad to say that the Indians under my charge are, as a rule, sober, religious, and law abiding."

John O. Arsenault, Indian Agent at Egmont Bay, Prince Edward Island, reports, August 22, 1892: "There appears to be a certain emulation among them in improving their condition; they have made considerable progress during the last fifteen years," etc.[1]

Such, generally speaking, was the social, religious, and temporal condition of the tribes composing the 4000 souls known as the Micmac Indians, who, nearly three centuries ago, were converted to Christianity by Catholic missionaries, and who have since resided in the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island.

The Indians are prone to councils, and have been so for all time. The assembling of these Micmacs every year during the last week in July, during the octave of the festival of St. Anne, as mentioned, bears much resemblance to an annual tribal council. To the Indians, St. Anne's festival is one of the most important solemnities in their year's life; with them, it is even more honored than by Catholics, perhaps, in the Province of Quebec; and the custom originated in the earliest days of Christianity among them.

Fair-minded Americans, who have been disposed to aid the continuous efforts made in Congress to cripple the missionary schools among the American Indians west of the Mississippi, by cutting off the annual appropriations made for their partial support, might perhaps change their opinions after a careful study of the annual reports of the Indian Department of the Dominion of Canada.

---

[1] *Annual Report* of the Department of Indian Affairs of the Dominion of Canada, for 1892, pp. 34, 37, 40, 42, and 45.

The large number of Catholic mission schools maintained, the reports of the status of these schools, the improved condition of the resident and even the nomadic tribes, will surprise many.

It concerns the taxpayers of this country also to study the problem of the disparity of the cost to each government for the care of its Indian population. It has been stated that $160 per capita per annum is the cost to the United States Government, while it costs the Government of the Dominion of Canada only $35.

The printed works noted in the "Algonquian Bibliography," by Mr. Pilling, in their chronological order, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, having been considered, the works in manuscript during the same period, which may be found to be of more interest, will be considered in another article.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

INDIFFERENTISM.

"There is a master of scoffing that in his catalogue of books of a feigned library sets down this title of a book, *The Morres-Dance of Hereticks.* For indeed every sect of them hath a diverse posture or cringe which cannot but move derision in worldlings and depraved politickes."—BACON, *Essay on Unity of Religion.*

PROTESTANT England was once on fire with the spirit of religion. It was a spirit of bigotry, yet zealous and earnest. It was a spirit of persecution, yet founded on deep, though false, conviction. It was a spirit that brooked no opposition, domineering and intolerant; that upturned the altars at which long generations had worshipped; that tore down the figure of Christ the Crucified and trampled it under foot; that broke in pieces the images of saints in painted glass and graven metal and carved stone; that drove into exile or racked and tortured unto death priests and people of the ancient faith.

Protestant England was no doubt deeply in error, but it was also beyond all mistake deeply in earnest. The error remains, but the earnestness, where is it? It has long since departed. That fiery fanaticism is now burnt out, and what is there but empty niche and desecrated tomb and pillaged shrine amid ruins of chapel and abbey and cathedral to remind us that it once blazed so fiercely? Quenched indeed is that ardent spirit of Puritanism, but from the dead embers there has sprung up a new spirit; a spirit of live and let live; a spirit of tolerance; a spirit of indifference; a spirit that is tolerant precisely because it is indifferent. From these dead ashes of profound Puritanism there has started into life a new spirit of shallow philosophism that is filling men's hearts, not with deeper respect for religion, but with a complacent patronage of Almighty God.[1] Persecuting Protestantism maintained that worship of God

[1] Compare the following eloquent passage from Ruskin:

"The form which the infidelity of England, especially, has taken, is one hitherto unheard of in human history. No nation ever before declared boldly, by print and word of mouth, that its religion was good for show, but 'would not work.' Over and over again it has happened that nations have denied their gods, but they denied them bravely. The Greeks in their decline jested at their religion, and frittered it away in flatteries and fine arts; the French refused theirs fiercely, tore down their altars and broke their carven images. The question about God with both these nations was still, even in their decline, fairly put, though falsely answered. 'Either there is or there is not a Supreme Ruler; we consider of it, declare there is not, and proceed accordingly.' But we English have put the matter in an entirely new light: 'There is a Supreme Ruler, no question of it, only He cannot rule. His orders won't work. He will be quite satisfied by euphonious and respectful repetition of them. Execution

should take but one form, the form of psalm-singing, image-breaking Puritanism; and it strove to force the consciences of its opponents by the rack, and the thumbscrew, and the block, and the gibbet. Nowadays, however, the pulse of Protestantism throbs no longer with this fiery excitement of Puritanical zeal. Its pulse has grown sluggish with the torpor of indifferentism. The cold has reached its heart. Protestantism, as that creed at its birth was understood, is well-nigh dead; dead and buried, it might be said, were it not for a sprinkling of honest folk in out-of-the-way places who cling to old-fashioned prejudices and lag far in rear of the logical and intellectual developments of their age. It is a matter which Catholics may be thankful for that Prostestantism is very tolerant now. It persecutes no more. It no longer puts pressure on any man's conscience. And why not? Because it holds that one religion is just as good as another. It is, as we say, indifferentist.

Now, indifferentism is not the same thing as atheism, though it leads to it, as will presently be shown. Nay, modern enlightenment in the present stage of its development is not only willing to allow that God exists; it will even grant that He should be adored, with, however, this important qualification, that whether the divine worship is to take this form or that is a matter solely for the worshipper himself to decide. Advanced thinking treats God as a distant acquaintance towards whom a faint show of civility is enough. It considers that God ought to be, and indeed must be, very well satisfied to be adored at all, without imposing on the worshipper the particular form of religion in which that adoration shall be clothed. That jack-o-lantern called the *zeitgeist*, or spirit of the age, holds definite and dogmatic teaching to be antiquated and out of date; a mere fossil, a piece of ancient history, the relic of a dead past, the shreds and tatters of a worn-out mediævalism, the last rusty link of the chains of a slavish age, a remnant of the barbarism of the Dark Ages impotently struggling for existence in the intellectual refulgence of our enlightened epoch.

---

would be too dangerous under existing circumstances, which He certainly never contemplated.'

"I had no conception of the absolute darkness which has covered the human mind in this respect, until I began to come into collision with persons engaged in the study of economical and political questions. The entire *naïveté* and undisturbed imbecility with which I found them declare that the laws of the devil were the only practicable ones, and that the laws of God were merely a form of poetical language, passed all I had ever before read of moral infidelity. I knew the fool had often said in his heart there was *no* God; but to hear himself say clearly out with his lips, 'There is a foolish God,' was something which my art studies had not prepared me for. The French had indeed, for a considerable time, hinted much of the meaning in the delicate and compassionate blasphemy of their phrase '*le bon Dieu*,' but had never ventured to put it into more precise terms."—*Modern Painters*, v., p. ix., c. 12.

Consequently, the English nation is now opposed to set formularies and dogmatic decrees and well-defined doctrines of faith. For if any one religion is as good as any other, it is but common sense to choose that creed which trammels a man least. Why be a Catholic with the obligations to attend Mass every Sunday, to abstain, to fast, to confess sins to a priest, if it is as easy to travel to heaven without these burdens as with them? Current thought looks on religion as a question of æsthetics; a matter of feeling or of taste or of sentiment. Englishmen assert their liberty to choose their creed as they choose their clothes, and claim the right to change their faith just as freely as they change their fashions. They demand leave for a man to form his views in religion as he forms them in painting or in poetry or in architecture; to form them, that is, without let or hindrance from man or God according to the individual's taste and fancy and character and inclination; and whatever view the individual thinks fit to adopt, with that Almighty God must be satisfied. And thus the modern tolerantist makes broad his phylacteries and enlarges the borders of his garments and gives thanks that he is not wedded to a fixed creed, a believer in dogma, an infallibilist, priest-ridden, narrow-minded, even as is the Catholic. This is the large and liberal religion of the day—a comprehensive cult which encourages you to hold any view and to entertain any opinion provided only you do not condemn the opposite of that view or the contradictory of that opinion. Do not be so intolerant as to think your neighbor in the wrong because he holds your coal-black to be snow-white. For this is to be broad-minded. This is to be indifferentist.[1]

The spirit of the age is a spirit of lawless liberalism in religion. The fashionable principle is this: Be respectable in your outward life; sin not against the easy code of social morality, or at least do not flaunt your sin in the public eye; do not shock your neighbor's sense of propriety and decorum; and then it matters little or nothing what your faith may be. The popular theory amounts to this, that if a man is upright in his dealings; if he is known for a faithful husband, a good father, a just master, a loyal citizen, it is unimportant to what creed he holds. Be he Catholic or Baptist, or Quaker, or Unitarian, call himself by the name of any one of the myriad sects that spring up, mushroom-like, around us, his salvation is in every case secure because all these religions are equally pleasing to God; each is a fair and flowery path leading straight and comfortably and pleasantly to heaven.

[1] Indifferentism, or, as it is sometimes called, latitudinarianism, or tolerantism, is used in a variety of senses. Civil and political indifferentism is that which tolerates different religions in the same state. Religious and theological, which teaches that all religions are equally conducive to salvation.

Now, strange as this theory seems to us Catholics, with our religion sharply defined, clear cut, unchanged and unchangeable, it is nevertheless a quite logical deduction; it is the only issue and outcome of Protestantism. Protestantism leads straight into indifferentism, and, in the end, it leads to rationalism,[1] on the road to which indifferentism is but the half-way house.[2] It may be convenient to point out that by the term "Protestant" is here meant that generic religion which comprises not only the four great branches of specific Protestantism—Lutheran, Arminian, Calvinist, and Socinian—but also all those other sects or offshoots which Anglicans sum up under the general name "Dissent."[3] By "Protestantism" we mean that negation of Catholicity which began its career by revolt against the infallible guidance and authority of the Church Catholic, which taught that there was but one objective rule of faith, the Scriptures, to be interpreted by the private judgment of the individual according to the light of his own unaided reason.[4] Of that religion private judgment is the keystone, and because such is the case, indifferentism first and rationalism afterwards must, both in theory and in practice, flow from it. This is the contention admirably developed by De Lamennais in his profound and eloquent, though, in parts, mistaken, "Essai sur l'Indifférence."[5] This, too, is the contention which Father Perrone worked out in his "Prelectiones Theologicæ,"[6] where he shows that Protestantism, in its *critical* capacity, by tampering with the canon of Scripture; in its *exegetical* capacity by interpreting Scripture according to the ever-changing light of private judgment; and in its *dogmatical* capacity by the introduction of those heretical tenets which follow from its first principles could only lead *de jure* and has led *de facto* into the grossest rationalism.

---

[1] The Protestant writer, Amand Saintes, in his *Histoire critique du rationalisme en Allemagne*, p. 7, writes: "Quoq qu'il soit vrai de dire, que les principes du rationalisme se confondent avec ceux du Protestantisme ou, du moins, qu'ils en découlent, et que l'établissement de la réformation devart amener inévitablement le rationalisme," etc.

[2] Leo XII., Encyc. *Ubi primum*, said: "Indifferentism not only boldly maintains that all the sects are on the right road (recte ambulare), but also those societies which profess pure deism and even pure materialism.

[3] The name "Dissent" is not very expressive. The offshoots of Anglicanism, etc., "dissent" from what? Not from that against which the mother-heresy "protested," viz., Catholicity; since the children are more bitter than the mother against the Catholic Church.

[4] *Cf.* Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation*, part i., c. 6, n. 56. "By the religion of Protestants I understand . . . . that wherein they all agree and which they all subscribe with a greater harmony as a perfect rule of their faith and actions, that is the BIBLE. The BIBLE, I say, and the BIBLE only, is the religion of Protestants."

[5] Vol. i., cc. 6 and 7.

[6] Tom. Post., *De Locis Theologicis*, col. 1414.

Protestantism is the parent of indifferentism. For without an infallible rule of faith there is no one to settle dogmatic controversies, there is no standard by which to decide that one form of belief is better or worse than another. It is worth while to emphasize the fact that indifferentism springs from Protestantism, as the oak from the acorn, and the bird from the egg. For all current controversy really hinges on the question of infallibility; and in demonstrating the existence of infallibility it is often useful to use the negative as well as the positive form of argument; that is, not only to prove that the Church of Christ is infallible, but also to prove that without infallibility there cannot be a Church of Christ. Infallibility is the great bulwark against indifferentism. Now Protestantism possesses no infallible voice, for infallibility implies an external authority and the Protestant principle of private judgment denies, in theory, all external authority. We say "in theory," because in practice the rank and file of Protestants adopt, and of necessity adopt, since they have not the means to judge for themselves, the particular views entertained at the moment by the minister under whom they happen to sit. Their pope is their parson.[1] But in theory the upholders of private judgment maintain that for authority to determine for the individual what to believe is simply tyranny. The duty, let it be said in passing, of one who is searching for the true religion is to use his private judgment to discover, not the body of doctrine which he must believe, for that is beyond his power, but the authority which will teach him what these doctrines are. This principle of private judgment, we have been assured by Prof. Blackie,[2] has saved the world from "the despotic and soul-stupefying sacerdotalism of the Romanists." In "protesting" against the authority of the Catholic Church, the reformers denied, and meant to deny, all external authority whatever in matters of faith. The chief indictment which Protestantism is ever urging against the Church is this: that she arrogantly claims an authority which Christ never instituted—the authority to decide in questions of faith.

External authority, therefore, and private judgment are contradictory terms; they are mutually exclusive. The very *raison d'être* of Protestantism is its denial of external authority. Prove that there exists an external authority in matters religious, and thereby you prove the falsity of Protestantism.

Yet without external authority there cannot be, in the present order of God's providence, any objective and trustworthy rule of faith; and without such a rule there can be no stability; there can be nothing to stamp one religion as better than another; there can

[1] *Cf.* "Edm. Burke's Letter to His Son," *Orthodox Journal*, vol. iv., n. 37.

[2] *Natural History of Atheism*, p. 184.

be nothing to save the world from indifferentism. For if in the voyage of life, beset with shoals and quicksands, the mariner has to sail over unknown seas in the dark, "tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine,"[1] without pilot, without chart, without buoys to mark the banks and channels, what wonder if he comes to regard one course as good as another, and to look on it as immaterial how he sets his rudder?

The Bible alone can never be an infallible rule of faith. For infallibility is a gift of God, and God never meant the Bible, apart from an authority external to the Bible, to be any man's guide in religious matters. Had it been so intended, the Bible would have been penned by Christ, and would have existed from the beginning of His Church. Yet for nearly a hundred years Christianity subsisted without the Bible such as we have it; and necessarily so, since the revelation contained in the Bible, according to the Bible itself, was in large measure made in the first instance orally, and was orally published long before it was committed to writing. For nearly a century, therefore, was the Christian Church with or without a rule of faith? Not without, as any Protestant will allow. Then, with a rule of faith that was not the Bible. This primitive rule of faith, then, must have been an authority prior in time, extrinsic to, the Bible. Does that authority yet exist? If not, how and when did it perish, and what is the proof that the earliest rule of faith instituted by Christ was supplanted by another?

Moreover, that authentic collection of inspired books we call "the Bible" could not exist as a collection unless there had previously existed an authority to put the collection together, and to vouch for the inspiration of everything contained in it. Once again, therefore, if there is to be a Bible at all, it is necessary to recognize an authority extrinsic to the Bible. For the Bible itself cannot testify to its own canon. The Bible, no doubt, faithfully records divine revelation. But it is only a record. It cannot guarantee the inspiration of each and all the separate books it comprises. A record is not evidence unless it is authenticated. And it cannot authenticate itself. Until, therefore, it has been proved what the authenticity and genuineness of the record is, its testimony has no *locus standi*, it cannot come into court. The word of a witness, whether book or human being, cannot be accepted as veracious testimony of that witness's veracity. What authority, therefore, extrinsic to the Bible, will a Protestant adduce to prove the certain inspiration of the Bible? This difficulty has embarrassed opponents a good deal, but they have found a loophole of escape. The French Protestant theologians, Claude and Jurieu,

[1] Ephes. 4, 14.

after much casting about, discovered that Protestants *feel* the truth of the canon, etc., of Scripture. They know truth, as Jack Falstaff knew the true prince, by instinct. "Ou sent les verités fondamentales comme ou sent la lumière quand on la voit; la chaleur quand ou est auprês du feu; le doux et l'amer quand on mange."[1] An original and convenient doctrine. Protestants *taste* the truth of the Bible. But this Protestant acuteness of palate does not cut away the whole difficulty. For "tastes differ," which perhaps accounts for the fact that, for example, Anglicans taste the truth of the divinity of Christ, while Unitarians do not taste it. Nay, some palates are so vitiated as not to taste Biblical truth at all. Such is the palate atheistical. What, then, is to be the authority for inspiration of Scripture? Not the "Higher Criticism," which can at most only claim to show what of Scripture is *not* inspired. Not tradition, which Protestantism maintains to have erred on many vital questions. Not the Fathers, since they establish, not the intrinsic truth of the tradition, but only what in their day the tradition was. It only remains, then, for a Protestant to fall back on his private judgment and settle his own canon of Scripture.

Consequently, the canonical Scriptures are not a rule of faith for the individual, but the individual is the rule of the canonical Scriptures. From which two obvious conclusions are deduced. First, that as the individual is subject to error, so the Protestant canon has no valid claim to be free from error. Hence the rule of faith that is to preserve from error is itself, *ex hypothesi*, probably erroneous. Secondly, that as no two Protestants, if left to their own private judgment, will agree on the same canon,[2] so no two Protestants will have the same rule of faith. Private judgment, therefore, is a principle, not of unity, but of discord; a centrifugal, not a centripetal, force. And as one man's private judgment is to him as good as another's, so the religion devised by the one is as good as the religion devised by another.

---

[3] *Le Vrai Système*, cited by Lamennais, *Essai*, p. 239. Truth has been defined as what a man *troweth;* but it should apparently be what a man *feeleth!*

"Truth means that which one troweth, *i.e.*, thinketh or firmly believeth."—*Diversions of Purley*, part ii., p. 404. This is a true etymology, and accurately explains *subjective* truth. Horne Tooke is, however, talking nonsense when he says: "There is no such thing as eternal, immutable, everlasting truth. Two persons may contradict each other and yet both speak truth; for the truth of one person may be opposite to the truth of another."—P. 404. He here confounds objective with subjective truth.

[4] Luther rejected the Epistle of St. James because it contradicted his doctrine of "justification by faith alone." The Anglicans retain it. Strauss questioned the authenticity of the four Gospels. Schleiermacher rejected from the canon the Epistles to Timothy. If Protestants are unanimous in rejecting several of the Deuterocanonical books, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Machabees I. and II., etc., it is only a negative unanimity arising from the fact that the great bulk of the people know nothing of these books or parts of books.

Protestantism, consequently, if it is to have a fixed, stable and certain canon, must fall back on the authority of the Church. It sets up the Bible against infallibility, and yet it can have no Bible until it has recognized infallibility. It is Protestant because it "protests" against infallibility, and yet, on Protestant principles, it cannot so protest without ceasing to be Protestant. It is the position of the wood-cutter who sits on the branch he is sawing away from the trunk.

It is plain, therefore, that the Protestant so far must make two concessions: first, he must admit, that in the first century of the Church there existed—even if it has since perished, of which there is no jot or tittle of evidence—an infallible authority external to the Bible; secondly, that without such external authority there would be no Bible. However, for argument's sake, let us overlook these initial difficulties and suppose that in some mysterious way the Protestant churches—"pillars and ground of the truth"—have been presented, say by some archangelic hand, with an authentic canon of Scripture ready-made. Even then the outlook is by no means clear. For there remains the question of the integrity of revelation. Are Protestants in possession of the *whole* of revelation? Given the canon, the Bible is no doubt a revealed record of whatever it contains; but it is nothing more. It testifies that it contains revelation, but not that it contains *all* revelation. Well, it will be said, may not this integrity be assumed? By no means. For revelation was originally, in the New Testament, given for the most part orally to begin with, and on what ground are we to base the assumption that inspiration was made coextensive with revelation, that the written word covers all the ground occupied by the revealed word? The only infallible authority for Protestants, or Protestant principles, is the Bible; and inasmuch as the Bible nowhere asserts that it contains all revelation, still it contains enough for salvation. A curious answer, truly, and yet the only answer a Protestant can make! But how is this astounding assertion to be proved? By the Bible or by an authority extrinsic to the Bible? Not certainly by the Bible, which nowhere makes any such statement. Then by an authority external to the Bible; an authority to which the Protestant is once again, by stress of argument, driven to appeal. To prove, therefore, that he has revelation enough for salvation, the Protestant must appeal to that authority, to recognize which is to cease to be Protestant!

The Bible, the sole rule of faith, though it *may* not contain all revelation, still does contain all that is necessary for salvation! An admirable subterfuge, certainly. For it can hardly be denied that whatever God revealed, He revealed for our belief. Christ said with remarkable clearness to His apostles and their succes-

sors: "Going, teach all nations . . . . teaching them to observe *all* things whatsoever I have commanded." *All*, and "he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mt., 28 : 19, Mk., 16 : 17). As De Lamennais wrote[1]: "Mais voici une chose étrange: Dieu révélera aux homnes des vérités nécessaires à l'homme, et les hommes ne seront pas obligés de croire Dieu, et ils resteront maitres de rejeter les vérités que Dieu leur révèle! Mais, à quoi bon une révélation? Mieux valait que Dieu gardât le silence!" In one word, the subterfuge is an insult to Almighty God.

Moreover, not only does the Bible *not* contain all revelation, and not only does the Bible *not* contain all that is necessary for salvation, but Protestants themselves, in the most practical and emphatic manner, recognize and proclaim that it does not. The private judgment of the individual measures his rule of faith and is compelled to find it wanting. He falls back on tradition. He is compelled to fall back on it. He has no choice but to go beyond and behind the Bible. The Anglican believes, against the Baptist, that infants must not be denied baptism. On what authority does he believe this? Of tradition alone. The Baptist believes, against the Quaker, that swearing under certain circumstances is lawful, though the Bible bids him "swear not at all."[2] What is his authority for the toleration of this practice? Tradition alone. And, to specify one more out of many instances, the sects observe the Sabbath on the first instead of the last day of the week with no authority but tradition for this serious deviation from Scriptural injunction and practice. The Protestant rule of faith, then, is not the Bible alone, but the Bible eked out by tradition. And who vouches for the truth of tradition? The Protestant must again doff his Protestantism and answer—the Church.

However, again for purposes of argument, let us make another concession to Protestantism. We supposed above a Protestant to have had the canon, in some mysterious way, settled for him, to have had it determined for him, in some manner we cannot understand, what are and what are not the inspired books which go to make up that miniature library we call "the Bible." Let us now go on to imagine that the Bible without tradition contains all that is necessary for salvation. These are large concessions to make, yet they do not advance the opponent far on his road to clearness. He remains sunk to the lips in a slough of difficulties. His rule of faith still fails him. For to have faith through the Bible alone, not only must he believe that the Scriptures are the Word, the whole Word, and nothing but the Word of God, but he must also believe, *without doubting*, all that the Scriptures contain. With infallible

[1] *Essai*, vol. i., c. vii..

[2] Mt. 5, xxxiv.

certainty not only must he believe that the Bible is an authentic record of inspiration, but also he must receive *with the highest certainty* each and all of the revealed truths contained in the Bible. Not his notions about these truths, but the truths themselves in their genuine sense he must hold to and firmly believe. This is a point that cannot be too strongly insisted on, namely, that the material object of faith—the *things* to be believed, as distinct from the *motive* for believing them—are the truths themselves, and not any one's crude and unauthorized notions of those truths. Divine faith is to believe without doubting whatever God has revealed. It is not, objectively considered, one thing for one man and another thing for another man; not one thing for one man to-day and another thing for the same man to-morrow. The truths of revelation are permanent, fixed, unalterable; the same yesterday, to-day and forever. These difficult truths, therefore, the private judgment of the Protestant must grasp in their genuine sense; and he must be infallibly certain that he has so grasped them. If he is not certain, then he has room for doubt; and where there is doubt there is no faith which by definition is "belief without doubt." Now, will any man in calm possession of his senses maintain that the private judgment of the individual can, unaided by authority, seize the genuine sense of a book such as is the Bible, written originally in foreign idioms by a variety of hands in a variety of styles, the subject-matter of which is, in parts, the most abstruse with which the human mind has to cope; a book that bristles with difficulties, as the students of the "higher criticism" are earnest to proclaim? And even if an individual, gifted with overweening confidence in his own ability, should hold that it had been given to him to master the full and genuine sense of all revelation, would he further assert that his interpretation of that sense was infallibly certain with intellectual certainty? For it is not enough to *feel* certain. Feeling is not faith. Faith is fixed, feeling is transient. A man may to-day feel certain that he is the king of spades, and yet to-morrow sink his claim to royal honors. In like manner the man who one month *feels* certain of Anglicanism may the next month be professing Methodism, and the month after be preaching Quakerism, without the object of these various subjective faiths being at all the objective truths revealed by God.

Let us emphasize this dogmatic truth that the certainty of faith is an intellectual and objective certainty. It implies a firm persuasion of the intellect grasping without doubt or fear of the opposite, and with the strongest positive adhesion, that which is objectively true, with a certainty that will enable a man to stand, in the intellectual order not like an aspen quivering in the breezes but steadfast as a tower four-square to all the blasts of heaven. For

faith, as we have said, is to believe without doubting all that God has revealed, because God is the very truth that can neither deceive nor be deceived. As, then, we are bidden to believe every iota of God's revelation under pain of eternal loss, it is obvious that God must have made that revelation easily and infallibly ascertainable in its full, clear and genuine sense by the due exercise of our natural faculties as thinking beings. By what process, then, is that full, clear and genuine sense to be for certain discovered and grasped? Only through the medium of a divinely commissioned teacher teaching under supernatural guidance—in one word, only through the infallible voice of the Catholic Church. But to that voice the Protestant turns a deaf ear. How, then, can he master with certainty the full, clear and genuine sense of Scripture? By the Bible or by the an authority extrinsic to the Bible? Not by the Bible, since no book can assure its reader with infallible certainty that his interpretation of that book is infallibly certain. Besides, the Scriptures nowhere give any such assurance. On the contrary, St. Peter[1] points out very clearly that there are certain things in the Epistles of St. Paul "hard to be understood which the unlearned and the unstable wrest, *as they do also the other Scriptures*, to their own destruction." Once again, therefore, if the Protestant is to have the certainty of faith, he must go beyond the Bible. His rule of faith has again failed him. He must appeal to authority. Is that authority fallible or infallible? If fallible, it cannot impart certainty since it has it not. Therefore, infallible. There is no trustworthy rule of faith unless infallible.

In concluding this part of the subject—that Protestantism *theoretically* leads to indifferentism, to Deism, and to atheism—we may be allowed to compress the above arguments into a nutshell. It is the fundamental principle of Protestantism that there is no rule in religion except that of Scripture interpreted by reason. Reason, then, is above revelation. It follows, in primary sequence, from this that if Scripture is to bind it must be *clear;* otherwise private judgment would believe without knowing what it believed and without knowing what the Scriptures meant it to believe. Moreover, that would be to put Scripture above reason, which, ex hypothesi, is absurd. From this it follows in secondary sequence that where Scripture appears to teach doctrines above, though not contrary to, reason—as the Trinity, the Incarnation and, in a word, all Mysteries—reason must either reject that part of Scripture or must interpret it so that mysteries cease to be mysterious. In which case the authority of Scripture is obviously nothing more than the authority of reason itself; and as human reason varies in

[1] II., 3, 16.

various persons, so the interpretation of Scripture will vary in various persons. Thus the religion of Christ would not be one but many. And that is indifferentism. Again, as reason is above revelation, it may accept or reject revelation. And that is Deism, which soon passes into atheism.

And not theoretically only but *practically* also—as experience makes painfully evident—is it impossible for a Protestant to grasp with certainty the genuine sense of that Book which he is never tired of proclaiming to be his one rule of faith. The Protestant heresy has had three centuries to prove to the world what principle of stability it possesses and it has shown itself unstable as quicksilver, changeful as the moon, restless as the sea, ebbing and flowing, chopping and changing, ever in a flux. That heresy started life, as Bossuet in his "Variations"[1] proved, by internal wranglings and disputings, by asserting and denying and modifying and explaining away. And as it began so it has continued, until the sects sprung from it have so multiplied that subtle ingenuity is required to coin for them names which shall not excite a smile. It has shown itself to be not a creed, but an amalgam of creeds, without consistency, without cohesion, with no principle of unity, with no connecting bond except that negative bond of bitter hostility to the Catholic Church. Not to mention the ephemeral sects that have been born, have flourished, have died and disappeared, who that tells over the names of that endless progeny of Protestantism chronicled by Whittaker, under the heading of "religious denominations," will maintain that Protestantism has grasped with certainty the full and genuine sense of Holy Writ? If so, where is that genuine sense? Among the Second Advent Brethren? or the Halleluiah Band? or the Full Salvationists? or the believers in Joanna Southcott? or among the Quakers, or Jumpers, or Ranters? among the Glassites, or Free Gospellers, or Christadelphians? among the Benevolent Methodists, or the Army of the King's Own? among the Sandemanians, or the Strictly Undenominational, or the Protestants Adhering to Articles One to Eighteen?"[2]

Protestants, therefore, as such and in so far as they act consist-

---

[1] The argument of the *Variations* may be put in a syllogism: "The religion of Christ being based on a revelation which is unchangeable is itself unchangeable. But Protestantism is notoriously changeable. Therefore, Protestantism is not the religion of Christ." Or thus: "The true religion is *one*, as truth is one. But Protestantism is not and does not pretend to be one. Therefore, Protestantism is not the true religion.

[2] The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small! They have ground Protestantism into hundreds of sects as euphoniously entitled as those in the text. Are not the very names of them enough to "move derision in worldlings and depraved politickes?"

ently with Protestant principles, have not and cannot have certainty in their understanding of Scripture. Consequently, as Protestants, they have not divine faith in the truths of Scriptnre. In this momentous conclusion—momentous because "without faith it is impossible to please God"—we are glad to have the opportunity to quote the Rev. Father Maclaughlan, who, in his admirable work, "Is One Religion as Good as Another?"[1] writes: "Lest I should be misunderstood (in the assertion that unless some infallible voice speaks it is impossible to make an act of faith) I wish to add: If Protestants can make an act of faith it is not *as Protestants or while resting on the principles of Protestantism.*" In other words, if Protestants make an act of faith at all, it is in virtue of an implicit obedience to that infallible voice against which their very name is a protest. Nor is this a new opinion. Balmez, in his "Protestantism and Catholicity," chap. 4, writes: "Protestantism talks of faith, and its fundamental principle destroys it." Again, Dr. O. A. Brownson, who was born in a Protestant community of Protestant parents and remained a Protestant until the age of forty-one, wrote:[2] "Protestants, in fact, have no faith; nay, so far from having any faith nearly all of them deny its possibility."

Moreover, that faith is for them an impossibility Protestant apologists appear to recognize, implicitly at least. For, though without certainty there is no faith, they are quite ready to allow that in religion we must be satisfied with mere probability. In a work entitled "The Battle of Belief," by the Rev. Nevison Lorraine, a Protestant clergyman in London, this doctrine seems to be enunciated.[3] In paragraph iii. he writes: "It is not only in matters of religion . . . . that we permit ourselves to be governed . . . . by a reasonable estimate of probabilities." Again: "Possibly the religious doubter shrinks from the acceptance of the doctrines of religion . . . . *on a balance of probabilities.* But the objection can only be taken by those who have not carefully considered the aspect of the question nor realized the weight which may attach to probable evidence." More than this, he quotes with approval the following from Mr. Gladstone:[4] "The religious question is one in which the duty of following affirmative evidence, even though it should present to the mind no more than a *proba-*

[1] Appendix. This work in 1891 had already, and deservedly, reached the twenty-seventh thousand.

[2] *Essays on Theology*, etc., Anno 1852, p. 37.

[3] There is much in this work deserving of praise. It is impossible not to admire the spirit in which it is conceived as well as the way in which it is executed. The good points are the author's own; the errors are those of his profession.

[4] "Probability as the Guide of Conduct," *Nineteenth Century*, May, 1879.

ble character and should not ab initio or even thereafter extinguish doubt, has the closest and most stringent application." Yet probability, as every one knows, leaves room for prudent doubt.[1] For, as on the one hand, certainty, even the lowest, by definition[2] excludes, so, on the other hand, probability, even the highest, includes the prudent fear that the opposite may be true. The opposite of a probable proposition is itself probable. If, therefore, it is only probable that the Bible is the word of God, then it is also probable, on the other hand, that the Bible is *not* the word of God. Consequently, how can any one be obliged—and that, too, under pain of eternal loss—to have faith in, *i.e.*, to believe, *without doubting*, what is, perhaps, untrue? If the Bible is only probably true, then the obligation to receive the Bible is only a probable obligation; and thus, according to the axiom *lex dubia non obligat*, a man is morally justified in withholding belief.

This Protestant doctrine of probability, propounded by Mr. Gladstone and endorsed by Mr. Lorraine, was condemned two centuries ago by Pope Innocent XI. The condemned proposition ran as follows: "The assent of faith which is supernatural and conducive to salvation is consistent with a merely probable knowledge of revelation, nay, even with the fear that God has not spoken."[3]

Protestantism, then, leads to indifferentism, and, in the end, to rationalism. For its subjective rule of faith, private judgment is no fixed standard, but varies in various persons, and makes unity of belief impossible. Its objective rule of faith, the Bible, is, on

---

[1] Mr. Gladstone confirms this (*l. c.*): "Probability may be predicated whenever, in answer to the question whether a particular proposition be true, the affirmative chances predominate over the negative; *yet not so as* (*virtually*) *to exclude doubt*."

[2] Certainty, according to Catholic writers, is made up of a double element, a negative and a positive; the former, which admits of no degrees, is the exclusion of all reasonable doubt or fear of the opposite; the latter is a positive adhesion of the mind. It is the common teaching of Catholic theologians that for supernatural faith it is an essential prerequisite that the articles of faith be, on some ground, *evidently credible*. Cf. Suarez De Vert. Theol. Disp. f., Sec. 6, St. Thomas, 2–1, q. 1, af. ad., 2d, says: "Non crederet quis nisi videret ea esse credenda vel propter *evidentiam* signorum vel aliquid hujusmodi." But the correlative of evidence is certainty.

[3] Assensus fidei supernaturalis et utilis ad salutem stat cum notitia solum probabili revelationis, imo cum formidine qua quis formidet ne non sit locutus Deus. Condemned March 2, 1679. Compare the Encycl. of Pius IX., Nov. 9, 1846: "Human reason. . . . must diligently inquire into the fact of divine revelation so as to *know with certainty* that God has spoken." On the other hand, Mr. Gladstone (*l. c.*) says: "We are justified in being to the last degree suspicious of a doctrine which sets up the liberty of man as being . . . . a positive ingredient in the claim of one alternative to be preferred above another." In other words, this champion of private judgment denies—seems to deny (*seems*, for his expression is vague and inaccurate)—the right to judge. Mr. Gladstone affirms—the Catholic Church denies—that you are bound to believe with divine faith before you have evidence. After all (*pace* Prof. Blackie), "the despotic and soul-stupefying sacerdotalism of the Romanists" compares not unfavorably with this unphilosophical view of the private judgmentarians.

Protestant principles, uncertain in many ways; uncertain as to its canon; uncertain as to its integrity; uncertain as to its genuine sense; uncertain as to the degree and kind of assent which it is competent to elicit. Protestantism cannot, therefore, be called a specific heresy. It is but a convenient label for a cluster or constellation of heresies developed by slow but sure evolution from that theological haze or sectarian nebula flung ha hazard into space by the great cloud-compeller, Martin Luther, and the other lesser gods of the reforming Olympos. Protestantism is the Odysseus of the heresies—*πολύμητις*—a heresy "of many shifts." It is the modern Old Man of the Sea, nimble to change its shape and assume any form by which to elude the grasp of the pursuing logician. With Gloucester, in Shakespeare's Henry VI., it may truly say:

> "I can add colors to the chameleon,
> Change shapes with Proteus to advantages."

It can be Ritualistic, Rationalistic, Romanish; Pantheist or Calvinist; Anglican, Lutheran, Unitarian; Low Church, Broad Church, High Church; blowing hot and blowing cold; expanding and contracting, rising and falling, according to the ever-changing pressure on the controversial barometer. It is never at a loss. From tradition it appeals to the Bible; from the Bible to the Fathers; from the Fathers to the Church, especially of "the first four centuries"; from the Church to reason and private judgment and certainty; from certainty to "probability that does not exclude doubt"; and then, as it were at last, it bolts into the covert of the "Higher Criticism" and the *zeitgeist*, only to issue forth at the other side and begin a new round of evasions, as unabashed and glib as ever, a perfect babblement of Babeldom, stiffly denying what it had before stoutly affirmed,[1] and presently as strongly affirming what it had just now indignantly denied; ever wonder-

[2] For example, is it not a historical fact that Protestantism at the outset proclaimed good works to be useless and faith alone necessary? Does not the Protestantism of to-day declare faith to be vain and good works—"a good life"—alone necessary? Did it not originally deny purgatory and accept hell? Does it not now uphold purgatory and reject hell? for God is too good, we are told by divines in high places, to burn the unrepentant sinner for all eternity; yet if hell is to end, it has ceased to be hell and has become purgatory. And is it not a fact that you may listen to one Protestant minister preaching the doctrine of the real presence and exhorting to hear Mass, while in the same city and at the same hour you may hear another Protestant minister denouncing the Eucharist and the Mass as idolatry and superstition? Macaulay (*Hist.*, chap. i.) fully recognized this "variability" of Protestantism: "Arminian doctrines which at the time of the accession of James no clergyman could have avowed without imminent risk of being stripped of his gown, were now the best title to preferment. A divine of that age, who was asked by a simple country gentleman what the Arminians held, answered with as much truth as wit, that they held all the best bishoprics and deaneries in England."

ing at your wonder, amused at your surprise, lifting its eyebrows at your scrupulosity, and quite sincerely scandalized at the narrowness of mind and rigid intolerance of the Catholic intellect that will persist in maintaining that of two contradictories both cannot at the same time be true.

Protestantism, therefore, has led—and could not but lead—to a Babel of contradictions amid the nubbub of which the English mind, seeking for truth in religion and finding none, amid the unrest of which the English heart, seeking spiritual consolation in religion and finding none, is driven out of very weariness to give up the quest in despair and to sit down perforce with any or no form of belief.

Yet indifferentism is false and without foundation in either reason or in revelation.

Indifferentism is against reason. For, let us ask, is this statement that one religion is just as good as another to be taken as a universal proposition, or as qualified by certain unstated limitations? And if as a general proposition, then let us make this further inquiry: If one religion is as good as another, is it as good to be a Buddhist as an Anglican? Is it as good to be a Mahommedan as a Methodist? Is it as good to be a follower of Confucius as to be a follower of William Penn? And if it *is* as good, why does England send out tens of thousands of pounds sterling a year for the conversion of the Buddhist and the Mohammedan and the disciple of Confucius. And if it is *not* as good, why not? If one religion is as good as another, why is not Buddhism or Mahommedanism or Confucianism as good as Anglicanism or Methodistism or Quakerism? Modern enlightenment is not as yet prepared to push its theory to its full logical issue, and to assert the equality of all religions, whether Christian or Pagan. Advanced thought, for the present, limits its contention to this: that any one Christian religion is just as good as any other Christian religion. But what, we ask, is the *principle* of this limitation? If one religion is as good as another, *why* is not the worship of the non-Christian as good as the worship of the Christian? The answer comes pat enough: that faith in Christ is an essential of salvation. Well, but *why* is it an essential; on indifferentist principles? If a man is at liberty to reject *some* of the doctrines which Christ taught, and the indifferentist is satisfied with *some*, otherwise he would not be an indifferentist, why may he not reject them all? Why is a religion good if it accept some small fraction of our Lord's teaching, and yet bad if it accept none? Let the indifferentist enunciate, if he can, the principle according to which you may lawfully reject any part of Christ's teaching provided only that you do not reject the whole. The indifferentist position, in

truth, amounts to this: that a non-Christian religion is not as good as a Christian religion because at least a partial belief in Christ is an essential; but why, on his theory, it should be an essential he is quite unable to say.

But the difficulty does not stop here. We are told that even on indifferentist principles, belief in Christ is an essential condition of salvation. Now does the indifferentist mean by this, belief in Christ as God or only as man? If he means belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ, then even Christian religions cannot all be equally good, and therefore indifferentism is false. For example, the Unitarians are a Christian sect and yet they deny the divinity of Jesus. Is then Unitarianism as good as any other religion? If it is, then faith in Christ, as God, is not an essential. If it is not, then the theory is false that any one Christian religion is as good as any other Christian religion. To save his position, therefore, the indifferentist is driven to confess that faith in Christ as man, is enough. But if this be true, indifferentism must become more elastic; it must open out its arms wider so as to embrace those non-Christian religions that believe in Christ as man. For example, he must include the Mohammedans who believe in Christ as man.[1] But in this case the liberal in religion must withdraw the limitation with which he started and must allow that if one religion is just as good as another, it is as good to be a non-Christian as a Christian; it is as good to be a Mahommedan as a Methodist. And if that view be correct, we may be allowed to ask again why Methodists subscribe so liberally towards Christian missions to the Mahommedans?

"One religion is as good as another." It follows, therefore, that the particular doctrine, the characteristic note, the distinguishing tenet which differentiates one Christian religion from another is unnecessary for salvation. You need not be a Catholic and may reject infallibility. You need not be an Anglican and may reject the Divinity of Christ. You may join the Greek Church and reject the procession of the Holy Ghost. You may be a Unitarian and reject the Trinity. With the Presbyterian you may reject Episcopacy. With the Plymouth Brethren you may reject an external priesthood. With Anglicans you may reject five of the seven sacraments. In a word, if indifferentism be true, for every Christian sect that ever has existed, does exist, or shall exist you may reject some point of the teaching of Jesus Christ, and as the name of these sects is legion, so legion must be the heads of the doctrine taught by Christ which are unnecessary for salvation. To

[1] Turien felt this difficulty and cut the knot by confessing that "les Mahométans ne sont qu'une secte du Christianisme." *Le vrai Systeme*, p. 237. Nor was Hoadley less tolerant. *Cf.* Milner's *Letters to a Prebendary*, Chap. 8.

sum this up, if the indifferentist will but calculate the amount of agreement among the Christian sects he will find that, differing from each other at every turn, they are unanimous in little more than this, that there exists a God who must be worshipped and adored. But the Buddhist and Mahommedan and Confucionist also, teach that there exists a God of some sort who must be worshipped and adored; and thus we are led back to the question originally proposed, if one religion is as good as another, why is not Buddhism and Mahommedanism and the creed of Confucius as good as Anglicanism or Methodism or the creed of William Penn?

That is the first objection, drawn from reason, against indifferentism; it degrades Christianity and leads to Paganism. I now go on to show that it degrades God and leads to Atheism.

For if there is one fact concerning Almighty God which plain reasoning makes more certain than another, it is that God is truthful and loves the truth. Even with a man, the deepest insult you can offer him is to dub him a liar and a lover of lies. Who then but a blasphemer would have the folly to say of God that *He* loves untruth? When our Lord described Satan, His arch enemy—the antithesis and antipodes of God—He called him a liar and the father of lies. God, therefore, loves the truth. But more than this, God *is* the truth. As our Saviour Himself said, "Ego sum Veritas." "I *am* the Truth." Truth is of the very essence and substance of God. Consequently, God not only does in fact love the truth, but by the very exigencies of His being, He is necessitated to love it. God can no more cease to love truth than He can cease to be God, and to conceive Him as loving error is, by conception, to destroy His Godhead. By a law of His being God hates falsehood with a measureless and undying hatred.

Now to be an indifferentist and to assert that God is as well satisfied with one religion as with another is to make God a lover of untruth. The proof is easy.

For these different religions contradict one another. Now of two contradictory propositions one is true, the other is false. Two contradictories cannot both be true. Given the truth of one, the falsehood of the other necessarily follows. To demonstrate the evident truth of the one is, by the very fact, to demonstrate the evident falsehood of the other. So that if two religions hold contradictory doctrines, one of the two must inevitably be teaching error. For example, one creed asserts the existence of hell where mortal sin unforgiven is punished eternally. Another creed denies the existence of hell. Again, one creed teaches that faith alone, without good works, is sufficient for salvation. Another creed denies that faith alone is sufficient for salvation. Once more, one

creed maintains that the Pope is infallible and enjoys universal jurisdiction. Another creed denies the infallibility of the Pope and contends that his jurisdiction is limited. Now of these six contradictory propositions chosen by way of specimen, three are necessarily true, the contradictory three are just as necessarily false. Either there is a hell or there is not. If there is, then the sect that denies the existence of hell obviously teaches error. Either faith alone without good works is sufficient for salvation, or it is not. If it is not, then the sect which denies the value of good works obviously teaches error. Either the Pope is infallible or he is not. If he is, then the sect which denies papal infallibility obviously teaches error.

To say, therefore, that God is equally pleased with all religions is the same thing as to say that God is equally pleased with truth and error. It is the same thing as to say that God is like the devil, a liar and a lover of lies. It is the same thing as to say that God has ceased to be God. Consequently indifferentism, both in theory and practice, leads to atheism. To affirm that one religion is as good as another, is, as far as lies in man's power, to pluck God down from His throne.

But the indifferentist is not quite run to earth yet. He has still one little pin-prick of a hole by which to escape. For, he says, although the different religions do indeed contradict one another, still the points of difference are minor, trivial, unimportant; while the points of agreement are solid, substantial, fundamental. The difference is accidental, the agreement essential.

Yes, that is the usual answer to the argument just put forward —an answer too foolish and too flimsy to call for a serious reply.

For is it a trivial question whether for all eternity the condemned sinner is to burn in hell-fire or is not? Is it accidental and unimportant whether in receiving the Holy Eucharist you receive the real and true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ or you do not? Is it not fundamental whether a priest can forgive sins duly confessed or cannot? Is it not essential whether the Pope is endowed with infallibility or is not? And if any indifferentist has the hardihood to contend that these points are not fundamental, then let him furnish us with a rule by which to distinguish fundamentals from non-fundamentals. "Question," says the Protestant Jurieu, "epineuse et difficile à décider!" If private judgment renders agreement in religion impossible, it also renders impossible agreement as to what are the fundamentals in religion. For example, is infant baptism a fundamental? The Anglican affirms, the Baptist denies it. Is belief in the Trinity a fundamental? The Baptist affirms, the Unitarian denies it. And in opposition to all the sects the Catholic Church

teaches that everything is fundamental which God has revealed and the Church has proposed for our belief.

We have now shown that indifferentism is a contradiction of reason; it degrades Christianity and leads to Paganism; it degrades Almighty God and leads to atheism.

Moreover, that this fashionable theory is not less opposed to revelation than to reason is clear as the noonday sun. It seems, however, useless to press this point since the argument from reason is so overwhelming that if it does not convince, nothing will. There is also this further objection to drawing out the Scriptural condemnation of indifferentism, that the very persons, in controversy with whom we appeal to the Bible, will persist in fixing their attention exclusively on some particular text which seems to make for their own pet heresy. Each sect, in practice, rejects that part of the Bible which condemns its own particular errors; and thus, though the assertion is ever being dinned into our ears that Catholics make little, and Protestants make much, of the Word of God, yet it is as assuredly true that the Catholic Church alone accepts the whole Bible as that the Protestant sects *collectively* reject the whole.[1] Each sect, in practice, rejects or misinterprets that part of Scripture which condemns its own heresy; and as the sects are beyond number, and as each sect has its own distinguishing heresy, the doctrines of Scripture which the sects, taken together, reject, can scarce be counted, consequently it is accurate to say that Protestantism, the collective name for the sects, rejects the Bible.

Such being the case, it would not appear to be of much use to point out that an addition to, or a subtraction from, revelation spoils the whole of our Lord's teaching; that the gospel of Christ is not a heterogeneous collection of disconnected statements and uncorrelated truths, but a compact and organic body of systematized doctrines, every part of which has a vital relation to every other part; a body of which not only the symmetry is marred, but the very life is taken away by extraneous addition or substantial subtraction. You might as well cut the telegraph wires and then try by the electric current to learn the thoughts of a distant correspondent as lop and top and prune away the doctrines of Christ and then attempt therefrom to grasp "the mind

[1] Think of the amount of heresy that has clustered round such a text as: "Justus ex fide vivit" (Rom., i. 17, etc.). "The just man liveth by faith." It was on the strength of this and similar texts and of the doctrine of "Justification by faith alone," falsely deduced from the texts, that Luther bade his followers: "Pecca fortiter sed crede fortius." "Sin deeply, but believe more deeply." It mattered little to Luther that St. James and others had scotched this heresy in the text: "By works a man is justified and *not* by faith alone" (2, 24).

of Christ."[1] It is hard to understand how a Protestant can stand in the midst of the sects—while they hack and hew at the body of teaching which Christ gave to the world—while they make profession of every shade and phase of belief, unbelief and misbelief, and from the midst of this miscellaneous multitude can raise his hand and claim that *he* has the gospel of Christ; how he can read his Bible and not find matter for pause in that emphatic prayer of Christ to the Father, recorded by St. John,[2] that the children of the Church "may be *one* as we also are one"; how he can read without alarm that prophecy of Christ, recorded by the same apostle,[3] that "there shall be *one* fold and *one* shepherd," or that of another apostle,[4] that there is "*one* Lord, *one* faith, *one* baptism"; how he can read in the gospels and not have forever ringing in his ears that solemn commission which Christ gave to his apostles and their successors to go and teach "*all* things whatsoever I have commanded you. He that believeth not shall be condemned";[5] how he can read and not stand and gaze "like Joshua's moon in Ajalon," when in that epistle to the Galatians he comes to the vehement language of St. Paul, pronouncing, in all the simplicity and fervor of his apostolic spirit, on the head of him who shall add to or take away from the Gospel of Christ and thereby turn that gospel into another gospel which is not another, that terrible "Let him be Anathema." By what process of reasoning does the "Bible Christian" make his indifferentism square with that most emphatic and twice repeated condemnation of the "perverters" of Christ's Gospel? "I wonder that you are so soon removed from Him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel which is not another; only there are some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we (the apostles) *or an angel from heaven* preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be ANATHEMA. As we said before, so now I say again, if any one preach to you a gospel other than that which you have received, let him be ANATHEMA." If St. Paul were sent down from heaven to-morrow to pronounce on modern indifferentism, it is hard to see what stronger language than this he could use.

But, it is often said, if the indifferentist accept some fragments of Christ's teaching, and be doing his best, may he not hope to be saved? Doing his best! Can it be said that any reasonable being, who thinks at all, and yet holds to such a hotch potch of open contradictions and glaring absurdities as indifferentism implies, is really doing his best? And if it be replied that there

[1] I. Cor., 2, 16. [2] 17, 11. [3] 10, 16.
[4] Ephes., 4, 5. [5] Mt., 28, 19; Mk., 16, 16.

exist people so dull, or so prejudiced, or so preoccupied as conscientiously and after every effort made, not to see their way out of this intellectual jungle, then we must call attention to these cardinal texts of Holy Writ that "without faith it is impossible to please God.[1] "Teaching them to observe *all* things; he who believes not shall be condemned." By faith, a living faith, a faith energizing in a good life, we are justified. Faith is the basis of the whole edifice of that spiritual life upon which salvation depends. Yet it would be hard to show how the indifferentist has faith—how he "believes without doubting" *all* that Christ has revealed—since his creed is that any religion is as good as any other. There is a condemned proposition—syllabus No. 18—which clearly guides us to the mind of the Church on this subject. The erroneous proposition runs as follows: "Protestantism is nothing else than a diverse form of the same true Christian religion, in which, as well as in the Catholic Church, it is given to please God." The indifferentist, therefore—to take the most rosy view of his future prospects—has small reason for self-gratulation in his indifferentism.

Nor is this all. There is another phase or fact of indifference to which we allude with much diffidence, because in a paper such as the present the writer's motive is liable to be construed into a desire for a controversial victory; and yet a phase of such practical import that no Catholic, and, above all, no priest, who has the salvation of souls at heart, can well pass it over in silence. For even if it be true that there is in the well-meaning indifferentist some sort of vague and inchoate faith which the goodness of our Father in heaven will, in the mysteries of His Providence, accept as solid and sterling coin of the spiritual mint, there still remains another question which solemnly and imperatively clamors for an answer. The indifferentist, like the rest of mankind, is a sinner. There is no uncharity, we hope, in that assumption. The holiest, the wisest, the strongest—David, Solomon, Samson—fell; nor is there aught in the liberal principles of the indifferentist to suppose that he is in morals above the common lot of men. If sin is so rampant, even among those who enjoy abundant help of the sacraments, the indifferentist is not likely without that aid to escape a fall—at least one fall. For, to give a foothold to our argument, one sin is sufficient. One serious fall is enough to occasion the supremely important question to which we refer, namely, *How is that sin to be forgiven?* Our merciful Lord has established a tribunal for the forgiveness of sin, the tribunal of confession. But the indifferentist rejects confession. Where then and how shall he find remittance? There is but one way—by

[1] Heb., 11, 6.

an act of "perfect contrition." An act, however, of perfect contrition is not so easily elicited. Nay, we do not think it is harsh or anything but theological to say that it cannot be elicited without grave difficulty, and, in rare cases, by one who has lived long in the utterly unspiritual atmosphere of indifference. Men only do easily what they have a *habit* of doing, and the indifferentist, we fear, has not a habit of contrition. It is only a hallucination, it is a mere clutching at straws for the indifferentist to flatter himself that, having cast away far from him the normal means of forgiveness instituted and put within his grasp by our Saviour, having lived his life in minimizing and underestimating the teachings of His Divine Master, God will then give him easily and at once the transcendent grace of that sweet bruising of the heart we call contrition; to repent, not merely from a selfish motive touching personal interests, to repent, not merely from a motive of hope or fear —such as that by sin he has forfeited heaven and deserved hell—but from the supreme and sublime motive of charity or perfect love of God. The indifferentist who would cleanse his soul of sin by an act of perfect contrition must be chiefly and formally moved in that act—not necessarily so as to exclude, but certainly not so as to be primarily impelled by the lower considerations of hope and fear—by the selfless motive of pure love of God for God's own sake, whom he must love above all created things so as, if occasion arose, to be willing to endure any privation or any pain rather than offend God by a grievous sin. That such an act in such a case seems difficult none can deny; that it is impossible no theologian will insinuate. Heretics, indeed, as such and in so far as they knowingly persevere in that heresy, cannot be saved. Such, however, are probably few—"rari nantes in gurgite vasto." But there are many whose heresy is material only and not formal; who, invincibly ignorant, are in good faith and therefore belong to the *soul* of the Church, though separate from the visible communion. Of such, these were the consoling words uttered by Pius IX. in his encyclical to the Italian Episcopate, August 10, 1863: "It is known to us and to you that those who are in invincible ignorance of our holy religion and who, carefully fulfilling the natural law and the precepts thereof inscribed by God in the hearts of all, besides being in the disposition to obey God, live a good and upright life—can, by the aid of divine light and grace, attain to life eternal."

But none the less, indifferentism is the great moral curse of our age. It was intimated that when Christ cometh He shall scarcely find faith upon the earth. And that is what indifferentism is bringing the world to.

CHARLES COUPE, S. J.

MARYLAND OR RHODE ISLAND—LORD BALTIMORE OR ROGER WILLIAMS—WHICH WAS FIRST?

IT has always been a proud boast of Catholics in America that the first example, among the original thirteen colonies, of a State, in an age of persecution, laying its very foundation upon the broad principle of religious liberty, was the Catholic Colony of Maryland. Historians have conceded this honorable distinction and precedence to Catholic Maryland, and the authorities quoted in support of the Catholic claim have been mostly Protestant authorities, who have been profuse in their eulogies of Lord Baltimore and the Catholics of Maryland, who, by their tolerance towards the professors of every Christian sect, when intolerance was driving men for conscience sake from other American colonies, won for Maryland the title of "Land of the Sanctuary."

Rhode Island, too, and Roger Williams, its founder, have won historic honor by the same exalted practice of religious tolerance, and in opening the new colony of Providence to men of every creed. Lord Baltimore announced as the fundamental law of his colony that he would not by himself, nor any person, directly nor indirectly, trouble, molest, or discountenance any person whatever, in the said province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ. Roger Williams, too, in the same spirit of benevolence, laid the foundations of his colony on the announcement that its citizens owed obedience to the civil authority, represented by the majority, only in civil matters. Lord Baltimore and Roger Williams both endured persecution for the cause of freedom of worship and religious liberty.

The late eminent Cardinal Manning, after stating what Lord Baltimore did for freedom of conscience, thus proceeds to state the fundamental principle involved in the toleration practiced in Maryland: "Such was the commonwealth founded by a Catholic upon the broad moral law I have here laid down—that faith is an act of the will, and that to force men to profess what they do not believe is contrary to the law of God, and to generate faith by force is morally impossible."[1]

Some twenty years ago an attempt was made in Protestant sources

[1] *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance*, etc., N. Y. edition, Harpers, p. 88.

on both sides of the Atlantic to dispute the claim of Catholic Maryland to the meed of praise which the voice of history had always given to her and to Lord Baltimore without previous contradiction; but it was promptly met and refuted by a descendant of one of the Catholic founders of Maryland, a reply which the late Dr. John Gilmary Shea pronounced "a triumphant vindication." The pamphlet then or previously published by the Rev. Ethan Allen fully discloses the nature of the ground then assumed by the opponents of the Catholic claim by its title, "Maryland Not a Catholic Colony." Since that time no attempts have been made to dispute the prestige gained by Lord Baltimore and the Catholics of Maryland. During this interval, two important works have appeared on the subject, "The Foundation of Maryland," by General Bradley T. Johnson, and "The History of Maryland," by J. Thomas Scarf.

In the present paper the writer proposes to show that, although Maryland was not the only one of the old thirteen colonies to build the commonwealth on the basis of religious liberty, *she was the first.* Rhode Island came nearest to Maryland in point of time, and if any State could claim to contest the honor with Maryland, it would be Rhode Island. A consideration of historic dates, and the presentation of the highest historical authorities, we think, will establish the prior claim of Maryland.

The earliest date assigned for the foundation of Rhode Island as a new colony, and consequently for the first possible act of Roger Williams, its founder, in favor of religious liberty, was 1636, when Roger Williams prepared the compact amongst its colonists, and which stood at the beginning of the first record-book of Providence Plantations. By this compact the citizens of Rhode Island were obliged to bind themselves "to be obedient to the orders of the majority only in civil things." This certainly was a charter of religious liberty, which sheds renown on Roger Williams and the State he founded. The date of this event is important in our present inquiry. The compact of citizenship and of religious liberty in Rhode Island being placed in 1636, our history will clearly demonstrate that religious liberty in Maryland was of a prior date.

While religious toleration in Rhode Island unquestionably and admittedly dates its beginning with this compact of Roger Williams and his colonists, it would be a grave historical error to assign the beginning of religious liberty in Maryland to the year 1648, when the oath of office, guaranteeing religious liberty, was prescribed by Lord Baltimore for all persons holding office under his government. The Rhode Island compact, as written by Roger Williams, was: "We, whose names are hereunder, desirous to in-

habit in the town of Providence, do promise to subject ourselves, in active or passive obedience, to all such orders or agreements as shall be made for public good of the body, in an orderly way, by the major consent of the present inhabitants, masters of families, incorporated together in a town fellowship, and others whom they shall admit into the same, *only in civil things*." From this the inference is conceded fairly that they were free in all religious matters. The Maryland oath, however, ran as follows: "I do further swear that I will not by myself, nor any person, directly nor indirectly, *trouble, molest, or discountenance, any person whatever, in the said Province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, and in particular no Roman Catholic, for or in respect of his or her religion, nor his or her free exercise thereof within this Province*, so as they be not unfaithful to his said lordship, or molest or conspire against the civil government established here under him."

And in addition to the above official oath, which was required by Lord Baltimore of the governor and council, there was added to the oath required by the governor the following remarkable passage: "Nor will I make any difference of persons in conferring offices, rewards or favors proceeding from the authority which his said lordship hath conferred upon me, as his lieutenant here, *for or in respect of their said religion* respectively, but merely as I shall find them faithful and well deserving of his said lordship, and to the best of my understanding, endowed with moral virtues and abilities, fitting for such rewards, offices or favors, wherein my prime aim and end, from time to time, shall sincerely be the advancement of his said lordship's service here, and the public unity and good of the Province, without partiality to any, or any other sinister end whatsoever, and if any other officer, or person whatsoever, shall, during the time of my being his said lordship's lieutenant here, without my consent, or privity, molest or disturb any person within this province professing to believe in Jesus Christ, merely for or in respect of his or her religion, or the free exercise thereof, upon notice or complaint thereof made to me, I will apply my power and authority to relieve and protect such person and to punish the persecutor," etc.

These official oaths are important, and still more so is the famous Religious Liberty Act, which formed a part of the enlightened policy of Lord Baltimore in Maryland. And we set forth here both the foregoing official oaths and the Act of Religious Liberty of 1649, since they have never before appeared in the pages of this REVIEW, and because they show the real state of the law in Catholic Maryland on the subject of religious liberty under Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, the actual founder of the colony.

As a matter of history, it should be stated that Lord Baltimore

in England prepared these official oaths, and the Toleration Act, and sent them over to Maryland in order that the Toleration Act and fifteen other acts should be enacted by the assembly. The Toleration Act was the first of the sixteen acts passed; it was enacted by the assembly on April 21, 1649. The names of the lawgivers of 1649, who enacted the Maryland Toleration Act, constitute a roll of honor which should be known and remembered by every American Catholic more sacredly than the school-boys of Ancient Greece were required to remember the names of the three hundred patriots who died at Thermopilæ defending the liberties of their country. Their names, the Catholics being printed in italics, are: *Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore*, Lieut. Governor Stone, *Ex-Governor Thomas Green*, *Robert Clarke*, John Price, Robert Vaughan, *Cuthbert Fenwick*, Philip Conner, *William Bretton*, Richard Browne, *George Manners*, Richard Banks, *John Maunsell*, *Thomas Thornborough*, *Walter Peake*. It will thus be seen that nine Catholics and six Protestants co-operated in enacting this great statute of religious liberty. In addition to the foregoing oaths of office, and the *following* statute, the entire settlement, every person residing in Maryland, was required to take an oath reserving "Libertie of Conscience in point of Religion *to himself and all other persons.*" We will now give the text of the Maryland Toleration Act:

"An Act Concerning Religion.

"Forasmuch as in a well-governed and Christian commonwealth matters concerning religion and the honor of our God ought, in the first place, to bee taken into serious consideration, and indevoured to be settled, Bee it therefore ordayned and enacted by the right honorable Cecilius lord baron of Baltimore, absolute lord and proprietary of this province, with the advice and consent of the upper and lower house of the general assembly, that whatsoever person or persons within this province, and the islands thereunto belonging, shall from henceforth blaspheme God, that is, to curse Him, or shall deny our Savior Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, or shall deny the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost or the Godhead of any of the sayd Three Persons of the Trinity, or the Unity of the Godhead, or shall use or utter any reproachful speeches, words or language concerning the Holy Trinity, or any of the sayd three persons thereof, shall be punished with death, and confiscation or forfeiture of all his or her lands and goods to the lord proprietary and his heires.

"And bee it also enacted by the authority and with the advice and assent aforesaid, that whatsoever person or persons shall from henceforth use or utter any reproachful words or speeches con-

cerning the blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of our Savior, or the Holy Apostles or Evangelists, or any of them, shall in such case for the first offence forfeit to the sayd lord proprietary and his heires, lords and proprietaries of this province, the sum of 5£ sterling, or the value thereof, to bee levied on the goods and chattels of every such person so offending; but in case such offender or offenders shall not then have goods and chattels sufficient for the satisfying of such forfeiture, or that the same be not otherwise speedily satisfied, that then such offender or offenders shall be publickly whipt, and be imprisoned during the pleasure of the lord proprietary or the lieutenant or the chief governour of this province for the time being; and that every such offender or offenders, for every second offence, shall forfeit 10£ sterling, or the value thereof, to be levied as aforesayd, or in any case such offender or offenders shall not then have goods or chattels within this province sufficient for that purpose, then to be quickly and severely whipt and imprisoned as is before expressed; and that every person or persons before mentioned offending herein the third time shall for such third offence forfeit all his lands and goods, and be forever banisht and expelled out of this province.

"And bee it also further enacted by the same authority, advice and assent, that whatsoever person or persons shall from henceforth upon any occasion of offence or otherwise in a reproachful manner or way, declare, call or denominate any person or persons whatsoever inhabiting, residing, trafficking, trading or commercing within this province, or within any the ports, harbour, creeks or havens, to the same belonging, an Heretick, Schismatic, Idolator, Puritan, Presbyterian, Independent, Popish Priest, Jesuit, Jesuited Papist, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antinomian, Barrowist, Roundhead, Separatist, or other name or term, in a reproachful manner, relating to a matter of religion, shall for every such offence forfeit and lose the sum of 10£ sterling, or the value thereof to be levied on the goods and chattels of every such offender or offenders, the one-halfe thereof to be forfeited and paid unto the person or persons of whom such reproachful words are, or shall be, spoken or uttered, and the other halfe to the lord proprietary and his heirs, lords and proprietaries of this province; but if such person or persons, who shall at any time utter or speak any such reproachful words or language, shall not have goods or chattels sufficient or overt within this province to be taken to satisfy the penalty aforesaid, or that the same bee not otherwise speedily satisfied, that then the person or persons so offending shall be publickly whipt and shall suffer imprisonment without bayle or mainprize until he, she or they shall respectfully satisfy the party offended or grieved by such reproachful language by

asking him or her respectively forgiveness publickly for such his offence before the magistrate or chiefe officer or officers of the towne or place where such offence shall be given.

"And bee it further likewise enacted by the authority and consent aforesayd, that every person or persons within this province, that shall at any time hereafter prophane the Sabaath or Lord's day called Sunday by frequent swearing, drunkenesse, or by any unciville or disorderly recreation, or by working on that day when absolute necessity doth not require, shall for every first offence forfeit 2s. 6d. sterling, or the value thereof; and for the second offence, 5s. sterling or the value thereof; and for the third offence, and for every time he shall offend in like manner afterwards, 10s. sterling or the value thereof; and in case such offender or offenders shall not have sufficient goods or chattels within this province to satisfie any of the aforesaid penalties respectively hereby imposed for profaning the Sabaath or Lord's day called Sunday as aforesayd, then in every such case the party so offending shall for the first and second offence in that kind bee imprissoned till he or she shall publickly in open court, before the chiefe commander, Judge or magistrate of that county, towne, or precinct, wherein such offence shall be committed, acknowledge the scandall and offence hee hath in that respect given against God and the good and civil government of this province; and for the third offence, and for every time after, shall also bee publickly whipt.

"And whereas the forcing of the conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it hath beene practiced, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this province, and the better to preserve mutuall love and unity amongst the inhabitants here. Bee it therefore also by the lord proprietary, with the advice and assent of this assembly, ordaned and enacted, except as in this present act is before declared and set forth, that no person or persons whatsoever within this province or the islands, ports, harbour, creeks or havens thereunto belonging, professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall from henceforth be any waise troubled, molested or discountenanced, for or in his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof, within this province or the islands thereunto belonging, nor any way compelled to beleefe or exercise of any other religion against his or her consent, so as they be not unfaithful unto the lord proprietary, or molest or conspire against the civil government established or to be established in this province under him and his heires; and that all or every person or persons that shall presume contrary to this act, and the true intent and meaning thereof, directly or indirectly, eyther in person or estate, wilfully to wrong, disturb, or trouble, or molest any person

or persons whatsoever within this province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, for or in respect of his or her religion or the free exercise thereof within this province, otherwise than is provided for in this act, that such person or persons so offending shall bee compelled to pay treble damages to the party wronged or molested, and for every such offence shall also forfeit 20s. sterling, in money or the value thereof, half thereof for the use of the lord proprietary and his heires, lords and proprietaries of the province, and the other halfe thereof for the use of the partie so wronged and molested as aforesayd; or if the party so offending as aforesayd shall refuse or bee unable to recompense the party so wronged, or to satisfie such fine or forfeiture, then such offender shall be severely punished by publick whipping and imprisonment during the pleasure of the lord proprietary or his lieutenant or the chiefe governour of this province for the time being, without bail or mainprize.

"And bee it further also enacted by the authority and consent aforesayd, that the sheriffe or other officer or officers from time to time to be appointed and authorized for that purpose of the county, towne or precinct, where every particular offence, in this present act contained, shall happen at any time to be committed, and whereunto there is hereby a forfeiture, fine or penalty imposed, shall from time to time distrain and seise the goods and estate of every such person so offending as aforesayd against this present act or any part thereof and sell the same or any part thereof for the full satisfaction of such forfeiture, fine or penalty as aforesayd, restoring to the party so offending the remainder or overplus of the said goods and estate after such satisfaction so made as aforesayd."

Having shown the exact condition of the law in Maryland in respect to religious liberty in 1648, under the public and official oath then required, and more especially under the law of religious liberty, then already prepared by Lord Baltimore in England in 1649; the true question now arises, What was the law in respect to religious liberty in Maryland, what was the practice, policy and actual administration in Maryland in this regard prior to 1648 and 1649? Also at the time that Roger Williams founded Rhode Island with religious liberty as its basis in 1636? And, still more important for our present purpose, what was the condition prior to that? What was the law and practice in Maryland from the first landing of the Maryland Catholic pilgrims in 1634 to 1636? Did religious tolerance in Maryland begin to be practiced by the Catholic colony and its founder for the first time in 1648 and 1649? Did the official oath formulated in 1648 and the Toleration Act of 1649 give

its first origin to religious liberty in Maryland, or had it been practiced from the first foundation of the colony in 1634, two years before Rhode Island was founded by Roger Williams?

Was not the benign policy of religious toleration the actual and avowed purpose of the Catholic Proprietary of Maryland, George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore, from the time of his conversion to the Catholic faith, in 1624, until his Catholic colonists, under the leadership of his brother and lieutenant-governor, Leonard Calvert, landed at St. Clements, in Maryland, on the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25, 1634? When the first Mass was celebrated by the Jesuit father, Andrew White, in 1634, then was not Maryland, in fact and in deed, "The Land of the Sanctuary," The Home of Religious Liberty?

These are questions which must be sifted in order to determine whether it was to Roger Williams and Rhode Island, and not to Maryland and Lord Baltimore, the credit is due of being "the first in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice and not by the exercise of power."[1]

George Calvert was one of the most rising men in England at a time when none but Protestants could rise to eminence to office and emoluments. A graduate of Oxford, a man of fine education and extensive travel, befriended by Sir Robert Cecil, advanced to the rank of knighthood, appointed one of the two secretaries of State, a favorite of his sovereign, and an idol with the people of his native Yorkshire, who had sent him by an immense majority to represent them in Parliament. Such was the man of whom Bancroft says: "In an age when religious controversy still continued to be active and when increasing divisions among Protestants were spreading a general alarm, his mind sought relief from controversy in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church, and, preferring the avowal of his opinions to the emoluments of office, he resigned his place and openly professed his conversion." At the time of Lord Baltimore's conversion, in 1624, with sacrifice of the emoluments of office for conscience sake, and while, already seeking an asylum where the conscience would be free, Roger Williams was an Episcopalian, enjoying the patronage of Sir Edward Coke, whose favor he won by his short-hand notes of sermons and of speeches in the star chamber, and who secured for him a scholarship in the Charter-house, admittance and a matriculated pensionership in Pembroke College, Cambridge.

King James, who was not personally harsh to Catholics, was so moved by admiration for the manly and conscientious conduct of

[1] George Bancroft.

Sir George Calvert in renouncing his worldly prospects for his religious convictions that he insisted on retaining him as a member of the privy council, regranted to him the estates in Ireland which he had relinquished rather than comply with conditions a Catholic could not accept and exempted him from those conditions, and as a reward for his long and faithful services raised him to the peerage under the title of Baron of Baltimore.

But Lord Baltimore was not content to enjoy exemptions, honors and emoluments when he saw his fellow-Catholics suffering under the cruel penal laws of England. To offer up the Holy Mass, that sublime act of worship which Catholics felt bound to offer to their God, was a capital offense. Heavy fines were imposed on such as dared to defend the jurisdiction of the Pope, solely spiritual as that jurisdiction was. The oath of *spiritual supremacy* in the temporal prince or king was required by all applying for admission to the universities, the learned professions and public offices in the service of their country. Thus Catholics were excluded from schools and institutions founded by their ancestors. A second refusal to take the oath of spiritual supremacy was punished with death. But a few priests escaped the gallows and these were secreted in the houses of the faithful to whom they administered in secret the blessings of their religion at the risk of life. Laws were enacted to thwart the education of English priests at Douay for the precarious missions carried on secretly among English Catholic families; for it was by this means that English Catholics sought to supply the places of the aged priests who thus surreptitiously ministered and whose ranks were decimated first by the rapid work of the gallows and secondly by the inevitable process of death. Priests were not permitted to be educated or trained even abroad for their sacred calling in England. It was made high treason to declare the English sovereign a heretic or to bring from Rome any brief, bull or other Papal document or to use or recognize any such document emanating from the Pope. It was high treason to give or receive absolution. To possess or use an *Agnus Dei*, a rosary, a cross or a picture blessed by the Pope or by any of his missionaries was punished with perpetual imprisonment. If any Catholic fled from England to escape the excruciating penalties of these bloody laws, a code of cruelty, confiscation, imprisonment and death, well-likened to "Egyptian slavery and Scythian cruelty," he was required to return to England within six months under penalty of confiscation of all his worldly goods and possessions; as if this code of blood gloated in the delight of its cruel work, sought its victims as a deadly pestilence seeks its own and struggled to prevent their escape to freer lands. We have records of a book-dealer being

sentenced to be nailed to the pillory for having Catholic books on sale; of a priest convicted of high treason for having in his possession an *Agnus Dei* and for carrying on his person a bull of the Pope granting a jubilee, and he, like many others, expiated his simple piety on the gallows, as year after year the glorious line of martyrs were led to death. The laity were fined and imprisoned for not attending Protestant worship or for hearing Mass or for keeping Catholic books, the *Agnus Dei*, the cross or the rosary.

It was under such circumstances as these that Lord Baltimore, a Catholic nobleman in favor at court and enjoying immunities under a friendly sovereign, aspired to be the leader of his fellow-Catholics less fortunate than himself in seeking for them, though not for himself in distant lands an asylum from oppression and a home where the conscience would be unshackled. His conversion was in 1624; but as early as April, 7, 1623, one year before he accepted the cross in lieu of the coronet, he, meditating upon and in anticipation of his heroic steps and the further struggle in behalf of his suffering fellow-Catholics sought and obtained from the king a charter, and that a liberal one, for the province of Avalon in Newfoundland.

Such were the evils and wrongs under which English Catholics groaned, suffered and died that several efforts had been made by Catholic gentlemen or noblemen to found a colony in Newfoundland as a refuge from the bigoted persecution of the government at home. Such were the efforts of Sir George Peckham and Sir Thomas Gerard, in 1583, and that of Winslade, in 1605, whereby they endeavored to convene the persecuted Catholics of England on the continent and to convey these exiles of conscience to an asylum in the new world; and such the expedition sent out in the same year under Captain Weymouth by Sir Thomas, Lord Arundel of Wardour, and Henry Wriethesly, second Earl of Southampton.

George Calvert's efforts to open an asylum for his fellow-Catholics now followed, in 1627, and was the precursor of the more successful attempt which was subsequently made and resulted in the foundation of Maryland. Not only was it the design of this noble Lord Baltimore to seek a home for the oppressed Catholics of England, but it was his nobler purpose to go with them himself into exile, that he might share their labors, sufferings, efforts and sacrifices; for in the case of his own sacrifice, that of a favored nobleman at home, it was infinitely greater than that of his followers; for he could have remained in England and enjoyed honors, exemptions and wealth and have enjoyed his religion there through the ministry of a private chaplain residing in his castle with the connivance of the government.

He was now in equal favor with Charles I. as he had been with King James. He had previously been interested in American colonization and adventures, and he was no doubt a landed proprietor in Avalon; now he became the Lord Proprietary of the province, and the leader of Catholic pilgrims seeking freedom of religion and of worship. His intimate relations with the Catholic Lord Arundel of Wardour and connection by marriage with the family of Arundels, and the similarity of the Avalon charter to that which he subsequently obtained for Maryland, prove in advance his designs from the beginning to found a colony where religious liberty would be the corner-stone of the commonwealth. But the sequel proves even more of his noble purposes, and yet still more of his nobler execution of them.

Lord Baltimore embarked with his colonists in 1627 and arrived at Ferryland in Avalon on July 23d, carrying with him two seminary priests, Fathers Longvill and Anthony Smith, and a Catholic chapel was erected in which Mass was regularly said. But as the colonists were not all Catholics, George Calvert immediately put in operation the most perfect system of Religious Toleration, and he provided a place of worship and a clergyman for the Protestant colonists. It is a curious circumstance, showing the extent to which English persecution of Catholics was then carried, that the minister, Rev. Mr. Stourton, to whom and to whose flock Lord Baltimore had given a chapel, afterwards, on his return to England, preferred charges against his liberal benefactor *for permitting Mass to be said in Avalon.*

But Lord Baltimore was not deterred by the bigotry of others from practicing the most exalted justice, equality, toleration and beneficence to others. After a brief stay in the colony he returned to England accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Longvill. But in the following year he again sailed to Avalon accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Hacket, and by his own wife and children, thus making his permanent home and sharing a hard and distant colonial life with his people. It was said by Dr. John Gilmary Shea, in his "History of the Catholic Church in the United States," vol. i., pp. 31, 32, that "Lord Baltimore, in practically placing both religions on an equal footing, making both tacitly sanctioned, giving religious freedom to all, rose pre-eminently above his time. He nobly endeavored in Avalon to enable each class of settlers to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, and it was brought up against him as a crime. Taught by his rude experience, we shall see that in his next experiment, he left each class to provide ministers of religion for themselves, or neglect to do so as they preferred."

But this effort to plant a free colony at Avalon, like the previ-

vious ones, did not prove a success. Its remoteness, the severity of the climate, its ungenerous soil, the restrictions of the mother-country upon the fisheries, and the conflicts in which he had to defend his colony against the attacks of the French, convinced him that success could not crown his efforts. In 1829, Lord Baltimore embarked on shipboard with his wife and several of his children, with the priests and all his colonists, and abandoned Avalon, where it had been his brave and noble struggle to lay the broad foundations of the commonwealth upon the just basis of civil and religious liberty. His principal ship in carrying out the colony was the *Ark* of Avalon, as the *Ark* of Maryland was afterwards the floating chapel and shrine, which, accompanied by the *Dove*, brought the more fortunate colony from the Clyde to the shores of the Chesapeake.

There is also a beautiful Christian legend associated with the name of Avalon, which Lord Baltimore conferred upon his Newfoundland colony. Avalon was the ancient name of Glastonbury, in Somersetshire, England, where, according to this venerable legend, Joseph of Arimathea landed in England with his missionary companions; here the friend of Jesus received a grant of land from King Arviragus; here he preached the Gospel, he erected the great abbey, which became the most renowned monastic establishment of Britain. Here died and was buried Joseph of Arimathea, the "noble counsellor, and a good and just man; who had waited for the Kingdom of Heaven;" who boldly "begged the body of Jesus" from Pilate, and devoutly buried his crucified Lord in his own new monument in the garden "wherein no man yet had been laid," and who "rolled a great stone to the door of the monument." How many sacred and golden links there are, in the hidden learning of ages, which mystically bind our own America to the Cradle of Christianity; to Calvary; to the Cross; to the Crucified.

But the sacrifices and sufferings of Lord Baltimore in the cause of religious liberty were not yet ended. It was next his intention to settle himself, his family and colony in Virginia. He accordingly arrived with his family and followers at Jamestown on October 1, 1629. His surprise and indignation were great when instead of being welcomed to land and to settle in the "Old Dominion," as was due to a gentleman of distinction and to colonists of the same race and nation with the Virginians, and, as well, calculated to promote the prosperity of the colony, Lord Baltimore and his companions were refused a home in Virginia, unless he and they would take the oath of allegiance and supremacy, whereby he would swear not only temporal allegiance to his King, Charles I., but also swear that the King was the only Supreme Governor,

"*as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes.*" He offered to take the oath of allegiance, but he refused to take the oath of supremacy to the temporal prince, as long as his conscience held him to render allegiance "in all thing spiritual and ecclesiastical" alone to the Vicar of Christ. Refused permission to remain or a home on the soil of Virginia, he was ordered to embark on the first ship for England, and Mr. Scharf, in his "History of Maryland," says he must have been treated rather rudely, "for we find . . . . a record of March 25, 1630 (O. S.), which reads: 'Thomas Tindall to be pilloried two hours for giving my Lord Baltimore the lie and threatening to knock him down.'" But he was compelled to take passage for England in the first ship, and to leave his wife and children in Virginia. He afterwards sent for them, "but unfortunately," as is related in old chronicles and in recent histories, "the bark on its return voyage was cast away, and they were all lost, together with 'a great deal of plate and other goods of great value.'" After the expenditure of so much wealth and labor in the effort to plant his colony in freedom, security and peace, for it is known that he provided munificently for every want of the colony at Avalon, and the loss of all dear to him, except his three sons, Cecil, Leonard and George, well did Lord Baltimore write to his friend the Earl of Stafford, in 1631, "I have been for so long a time a man of sorrows."

It was during this period of Lord Baltimore's struggles and sacrifices for religious liberty that Roger Williams was still in England, graduated at Pembroke College, is said to have studied law, and if so, no doubt, under the patronage of Lord Coke; and it is certain that he was a clergyman of the Church of England, and as such secure from that bloody code of penal laws which drove Lord Baltimore's Catholic colonists from England and the gallows to Avalon in search of religious liberty, while it fostered and supported the English establishment. Avalon was the germ of Maryland.

Lord Baltimore now turned his hopes of an American settlement, for the freedom of conscience, to the land of Mary, and obtained from King Charles the proprietary grant of that province and the famous Charter of Maryland. The Charter of Avalon, granted by King James I., was dated on April 7, 1623, while that of Maryland, granted by Charles I. to George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore, was prepared; but in consequence of his death on April 15, 1632, was not signed and sealed. But it was issued to his son and heir, Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, published and confirmed, on June 20, 1632.

While countless historical testimonials could be quoted to show the exalted character of George Calvert, and his purposes in favor

of religious liberty, we will confine ourselves to a passage from the first and best edition of Bancroft's "History of the United States:" "Calvert deserved to be ranked among the most wise and benevolent law-givers of all ages. He was *the first* in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice, and not by the exercise of power; to plan the establishment of popular institutions with the enjoyment of liberty of conscience; to advance the career of civilization by recognizing the rightful equality of all Christian sects. The asylum of Papists was the spot where, in a remote corner of the world, on banks of rivers which, as yet, had hardly been explored, the mild forbearance of a proprietary adopted religious freedom as the basis of the state."

The Maryland charter, like that of Avalon, was prepared by Lord Baltimore. His advisers and assistants in this noble work of statesmanship were the English Catholic noblemen, the Earl of Arundel, Father Blount, provincial of the Society of Jesus in England, the Duke of Norfolk, and Lord Howard. Father Blount resigned the office of provincial in 1635 and was succeeded by Father Henry More, the great-grandson of Sir Thomas More, who was the Lord High Chancellor of England in the time of Henry VIII., the successor of Cardinal Wolsey in that office, the first layman to hold that office, and of whom the Protestant General Bradley T. Johnson, in "The Foundation of Maryland," says: "Illustrious for learning, piety, and patriotism, who had sealed with his blood his attachment to the old faith, and his defence of the rights of conscience." Lord Baltimore, the first and second, also consulted the General of the Jesuits, Father Mutius Vitelleschi. All these illustrious noblemen and Jesuits approved the charter and defended it against all objections.

Of this charter, the work of Catholic statesmen and Jesuits, General Johnson, a Protestant, says: "Instead of founding a Roman Catholic colony, as the Puritans had founded a Puritan colony in New England, it became apparent to his (Lord Baltimore's) wise mind that to secure any liberty at all, he must secure it by the safeguards which experience had proved had protected it for so many centuries in England, and that to make these safeguards more efficient than they had been in England, they must be extended to all, the title of all men to the rights of person, of property and of thought. He therefore determined to invite all men, of all Christian people, to emigrate to the new colony, under the conditions of the charter." Father Blount, in defending the charter, speaks of it as a "License for them to depart this Kingdom and go into Maryland, or any Country, where they may have free liberty of their Religion." And General Johnson, in speaking of

Father Blount's defence of the charter, says: "This paper proves that the Charter of Maryland was then considered and treated as securing liberty of conscience to Roman Catholics. It proves further that the Society of Jesus undertook to further and extend the planting of the colony, *with the full knowledge that the principle of religious toleration was to be adopted as one of the fundamental institutions of the Province, and toleration for Roman Catholics carried with it, of necessity, toleration for all Christians.*" George Bancroft, speaking of the charter prepared by Lord Baltimore for Maryland, says: "Representative government was indissolubly connected with the fundamental charter. . . . . For the benefit of the colony, the restraining statutes were dispensed with; and, *at the appointment of the Baron of Baltimore, all present and future liege people of the English King, except such as should be expressly forbidden*" (and none were forbidden), "*might freely transport themselves and their families to Maryland. Christianity was by the charter made the law of the land, but no preference was given to any Sect, and equality of religious rights, not less than civil freedom, was assured.*" And the same author says that Cecilius, the second Lord Baltimore, "was the heir of his *father's intentions* no less than of his father's fortunes."

Cecilius, Lord Baltimore, now proceeded to organize, provide for and dispatch his colony for the new world. The time first set for their departure was September, 1633, but it was on the 22d of November when they sailed from Cowes. The bigotry of English laws and officials seemed intent on preventing these seeking after liberty of conscience from escaping the penalties of the persecuting laws of their native country, or from reaching the new home beyond the Atlantic, where peace and liberty awaited their coming. Oaths of allegiance and other preventive means delayed their final departure.

The lord proprietary defrayed from his own private means the entire expense of the first expedition. The two vessels that brought on the colonists were the *Ark* and the *Dove*. "These names," says Mr. Scharf, in his "History of Maryland," "were doubtless, of Calvert's conferring, and symbolized his aims and hopes; for these ships bore religious freedom and the olive branch of peace to the new world."

Such were the conditions and proposals to colonists, that land was offered before their departure from England, in 1633, and actually given after the arrival and settlement in Maryland, in 1634, to colonists without distinction of creed; and the people came without distinction of religion. For although the leaders, rulers, freemen and gentlemen of the expedition were Catholics, they were not the entire colony; the servants and others forming

the colony made a numerical majority of Protestants. The Catholic majority of freemen held the control in their hands, but all were invited, and all received offers and gifts of lands without distinction. That these terms were announced to all and embraced is clearly shown by the sequel.

In the very first year of its existence the Maryland colony was plunged in actual war by the lawless usurpations of Ingle and Clayborne, leaders of a colony of Protestants, who had, without lawful authority or title, settled themselves on Kent Island. Bozman, a Protestant historian most hostle to Lord Baltimore, says; "In this situation of constant danger from the savages, and actual warfare with their own countrymen (Clayborne's party), it could not be expected that the colonists had as yet, in little more than a year from their first landing, extended their settlements beyond their small town of St. Mary's. The lord proprietary, however, had not forgotten to make arrangements for a more dispersed occupation of the country. There is strong evidence to presume that written propositions or 'conditions' upon which the colonists were to emigrate, had been propounded to them *before their departure* from England." These are now found among the recently published Calvert papers by Mr. Brown.

The following official document, containing the instructions of Lord Baltimore to his brother, Lieutenant-Governor Leonard Calvert and the Commissioners, as to the manner in which they were to treat the Protestants on board the *Ark* and *Dove* in the first voyage that brought out the colony from England to America, is important on the question of priority of toleration between Maryland and Rhode Island, especially since a claim of priority has been made for Rhode Island. This document is dated on November 13, 1633, and in such a question of priority, we might ask whether the year 1633 or the year 1636 came first. The instructions of Lord Baltimore on this point read as follows:

"I. Impri: His lopp (lordship), requires his said Governor and Commissioners that in their voyage to Maryland they be very careful to preserve unity and peace amongst all the passengers on shipp board, and that they suffer no scandal or offence to be given to any of the Protestants, whereby any just complaint may hereafter be made by them, in Virginia or in England, and for that end they cause all acts of Roman Catholique Religion to be done as privately as may be, and that they instruct all the Roman Catholiques to be silent upon all occasions of discourse concerning matters of religion, and that the said Governor and Commissioners treate the Protestants with as much mildness and favor as justice will permit. And this is to be observed at land as well as at Sea." Brown's "George and Cecelius Calvert," p. 46-7; or "Calvert Papers."

The colony was under the command of Leonard Calvert, a brother of Lord Cecilius, who was appointed governor, and the Catholics were accompanied by three Jesuit missionaries, Fathers Andrew White, John Althan and Thomas Copley. The Protestants did not then, nor for some time afterwards, avail themselves of the right conceded to them of bringing a minister of their faith with them. From the beginning each church was to support its own ministers. The only aid the Jesuits received from the proprietary government were the lands which, as freemen of the province, they took up, in common with the other colonists. They were not allowed, as no one was, to acquire lands from the Indians. The colonists landed and laid the foundations of St. Mary's in March, 1634; they immediately shared the spot with the Indians, received as a gift from them a small wigwam, which was used as a Catholic chapel; the erection of a little fort was an unnecessary precaution, as the Indians shared everything with the new comers and embraced their faith.

It was during this period of struggle for religious liberty, 1630–1634, that Roger Williams, leaving the established English Church, became a Puritan; he joined the extreme wing of that sect, whose views, leaning strongly towards those of the Baptists, tended greatly to the spread of the latter sect in England. He joined the Puritan colony of Massachusetts, and arrived at Boston on February 5, 1631. From Boston he went to Salem, where he was the assistant of the Puritan Pastor Skelton, and not long afterwards he became the assistant of Pastor Ralph Smith at Plymouth, where he remained two years. He was next invited to return to Salem to become the assistant and afterwards the successor of Pastor Skelton, and he remained probably at Salem until 1635.

Far from wishing to detract from Roger Williams's struggles and sufferings in behalf of the rights of conscience, we wish to make the most ample and just acknowledgment of them. We reproduce here his sentence of banishment from Massachusetts, as given in Arnold's "History of Rhode Island."

"Whereas, Mr. Roger Williams, one of the elders of the Church of Salem, both broached and divulged divers new and dangerous opinions against the authority of magistrates; as also writ letters of defamation both of the magistrate and churches here, and that before any conviction, and yet maintaineth the same without any retraction; it is therefore ordered that the said Mr. Williams shall depart out of this jurisdiction within six weeks now next ensuing, which if he neglect to perform, it shall be lawful for the governor and two of the magistrates to send him to some place out of this jurisdiction not to return any more without license from the court."

As an act of pretended clemency the magistrates offered to allow

Roger Williams to remain till the spring of 1636, for the decree against him was passed in the fall of 1635, provided he would dissemble his views. He honorably refused to do this. It had become known that he proposed founding a colony at Narragansett, based upon the very views for which he had been struggling and for which he was banished, so that it was determined to send him to England at once, and a small vessel was sent to Salem to carry him into banishment across the ocean. Being forewarned he made his escape from Salem into the wilderness, but he fell in with some friendly Indians. Mr. Arnold says of the views and sentiments insisted on by Roger Williams and for which he was persecuted, that, "In reviewing the measures which led to the banishment of Roger Williams we find that they all proceeded from the firmness with which on every occasion he maintained the doctrine that the civil power had no control over the religious opinions of men." But we cannot agree with Mr. Arnold when he identifies this doctrine with the right of private judgment. His sojourn among the Indians, on thus being driven away from his friends and family, he himself described, as "sorely tossed for fourteen weeks, not knowing what bread or bed did mean."

He announced the fundamental basis of his commonwealth as follows: "I having made covenant of peaceable neighborhood with all the satchems and nations round about us, and having, of a sense of God's merciful providence unto me in my distress, called the place Providence, I desired it might be for a shelter for persons distressed for conscience."

In the meantime and while Roger Williams was in England, Lord Baltimore, who, ever since his conversion in 1624, had struggled for the establishment of a State founded on the principle of liberty of conscience, had finally succeeded in carrying his beneficent purpose into effect on obtaining the Maryland charter in 1632, which his son Cecilius put into actual execution as soon as the Governor, Leonard Calvert, and the colonists embarked for Maryland in November, 1633, and which began to bear its first benign fruits on the landing at St. Mary's in March, 1634, and previously on the voyage itself, as we have seen.

From the latter date, 1634, two years before Rhode Island was founded, religious liberty and freedom of conscience prevailed in Maryland under the instructions and avowed purpose of Lord Baltimore, and it became the established custom and practice, the common law of the province then and thenceforth and without interruption, until the official oath of 1648, and especially the celebrated act of Toleration of 1649, caused the custom and common law to become the statute law of the colony. Authorities without number could be cited in proof of the fact that, while we

can afford to leave out the period of effort on the part of Lord Baltimore between 1624 and 1634, ten years, while Roger Williams was an Episcopalian in England or a Puritan in Massachusetts, the period of actual religious liberty of conscience and religious freedom under the exalted administration of Lord Baltimore and his Lieutenant-Governor, Leonard Calvert, from 1634 to 1636, shows that the Calverts and Maryland have a priority of two years over Roger Williams and Rhode Island.

In Lodge's "History of the English Colonies in America" (Protestant) we read: "*Yet there can be no doubt of the fact of religious toleration in Maryland at the very outset.* Where was Rhode Island then?

What could be clearer in principle or more explicit in statement of fact than the following passage from Scharf's "History of Maryland?" "As we have already shown, the evidence leads to the conclusion that the colony, though containing many non-Catholics, was a Roman Catholic settlement originally, and so continued until 1649, when the great Toleration Act was passed. *But this act introduced no new principle nor policy into the government of the colony; it was but the legislative sanction and declaration of a principle and policy practiced from the beginning.* And these facts that Maryland thus took the *lead in religious freedom* and was the *first community* in modern times in which the civil was effectually separated from the ecclesiastical power, not only do honor to its founders, but are of deep importance in the history of the world." . . . . "The early writers on Maryland history confirm our views, not argumentatively, but as *facts* undenied and unquestioned."

Wynne (Protestant), in his history of America, published in London in 1776, expressly states that Calvert's motive was *from the beginning* to find religious liberty in a settlement of his own founding, and that he desired and took measures to extend the same to all others. "His lordship (Sir George Calvert) was a Catholic and had formed his design of making this settlement in order to enjoy a liberty of conscience which, though the government of England was by no means disposed to deny, yet the rigor of the laws threatened in a great measure to deprive him, the severity of which it was not in the power of the court to relax. This settlement of the colony cost Lord Baltimore a large sum. It was made under his auspices, by his brother and about 200 persons, Roman Catholics, most of them of good families." (More recent research tends to show that while the leaders and controllers of the settlement were Catholics, the servants and others of humbler rank were Protestants and were numerically in the majority; but as they were not freeholders or freemen, they had no part in the government at first.) "No people," says Wynne,

" could live in greater ease and security, and his lordship, *willing that as many as possible should enjoy the benefits of his mild and equitable administration*, gave his consent to an act of assembly, *which he had before promoted in his province*, for allowing a free and unlimited toleration to all who professed the Christian religion of whatever denominations. *This liberty, which was never in the least violated*, encouraged a great number, not only of the Church of England, of Presbyterians, Quakers, and all kinds of dissenters, to settle in Maryland, which, before that time, was almost wholly in the hands of Roman Catholics." This last statement refers and is true only as to the governing class, who were at first all Catholics.

In 1751 and 1758, when under Protestant domination, the upper house of the Maryland Legislature insisted that the unjust double tax should be removed from the shoulders of Catholics, alleging as a ground therefor the fact that under Catholic sway *the foundations* of the Commonwealth had been laid upon the principle of religious liberty and equality. The lower house denied this fact, whereupon the upper house, after quoting the history of the colony under Calvert and the charter, answered the lower house as follows, both houses being composed entirely of Protestants: " After the charter was thus granted to Lord Baltimore, who was then a Roman Catholic, his lordship *emitted his proclamation to encourage the settlement of his province, promising therein among other things, liberty of conscience and an equal exercise of religion to every denomination of Christians who would transport themselves and reside in his province, and that he would procure a law to be passed for that purpose afterwards.*"

So, also, the following passage in Governor Sharpe's MS. letter-book, December 15, 1758, contains the additional official avowal that the Catholics of Maryland proclaimed and practiced religious toleration from *their first landing in* 1634. " It might, perhaps, be unknown, if not to the authors, at least to some of the propagators of the above mentioned report, that the people *who first* settled in this province were Roman Catholics, and that, *although every other sect was tolerated*, a majority of the inhabitants continued Papists till the revolution (1688), soon after which event an act was made here for the support of a clergyman of the Church of England in every parish, which is still in force (1758); and the Papists as well as Protestants are thereby obliged to pay annually very considerable sums for that purpose." " Upon the whole, my lord, I must say that, if I was asked whether the conduct of the Protestants or Papists in the province has been most unexceptionable since I have had the honor to serve your lordship, I should not hesitate to give an answer in favor of the latter."

General Bradley T. Johnson, another Protestant writer, who had

made an exhaustive investigation of this question in his "Foundation of Maryland," bears the strongest testimony to the same end throughout his learned work. "His (Lord Baltimore's) object," he writes, "was not only to secure a refuge for persecuted Roman Catholics, hounded from every hundred in the three kingdoms, where they might enjoy their religion in peace, but the larger and nobler one, that a great State should grow up, where the rights, franchises and liberties of Englishmen, freedom of person, security of property and *liberty of conscience*, the right to habeas corpus and trial by jury, to be taxed only by themselves, and to be unmolested in their homes and their families, should be secured and guaranteed to *all* its people forever." And again he writes: "Instead, then, of the foundations of Maryland having been laid on a policy of colonization and material development, or as the consequence of religious movement in England, or as the result of the teachings and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, the light now shed upon the contemporaneous actors, their motives and their acts, enables us to see that Lord Baltimore, *from the very initiation of his enterprise*, deliberately, maturely and wisely, upon consultation and advice, determined to devote his life and fortune to the work of founding a free English State, with its institutions deeply *planted* upon the ancient customs, rights and safeguards of free Englishmen, *and which should be a sanctuary for all Christian people forever*." . . . . "He therefore determined to invite *all men, of all Christian people, to emigrate to the new colony, under the conditions of the charter*."

In this noble work Lord Baltimore was advised and sustained by the Jesuits of England, through the Provincials, Fathers More and Blount, but also by the whole Society of Jesus through its General at Rome. In August, 1636, Lord Baltimore issued again his Conditions of Plantation, no copies of the proclamations upon which he induced colonists to join him in England being now extant, where he repeated the original conditions, and not only gave lands to colonists without regard to their sectarian preferences, but also confirmed the lands which, under his previous proclamations, people of every sect had enjoyed from the *beginning* of the colony, in 1634, and therein he specially mentioned the lands thus granted in the previous years 1634 and 1635.

General Bradley T. Johnson, who has thus written so nobly in defense of the prior claim of our Catholic ancestors, as the first to proclaim religious liberty in the new world, though a Protestant, is the same distinguished citizen of Maryland who recently presented to His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, a casket made of the wood of the "Old Mulberry Tree," at St. Mary's, under whose branches, in 1634, the first Mass was celebrated and the first offi-

cial announcement in Maryland was made, that the *basis* of the new Commonwealth was civil and religious liberty. Mr. Bancroft, again speaking of the landing of the Maryland Catholic Pilgrims at St. Mary's, says: "So that, upon the twenty-seventh of March (1634), the Catholics took quiet possession of the little place; and *religious liberty obtained a home, its only home in the wide world*, at the humble village which bore the name of St. Mary's." This again was in 1634, two years before Rhode Island was founded.

The first edition of Bancroft's "History of the United States" was published in 1854; the centennial or "The Author's Last Revision," was published in 1883. But even yet, in his last edition or revision, so much less favorable to Catholics than the first, there is enough of the truth left in the chapter on Maryland to refute the claim made in behalf of Roger Williams and Rhode Island as entitled to the credit of first founding a State on the basis of religious liberty. In the first place Bancroft cannot, in this mutilated edition, refrain from admitting that "Sir George Calvert deserves to be ranked among the wisest and most benevolent law-givers, for he connected his hopes of the aggrandizement of his family with the establishment of popular institutions; and being a 'papist wanted not charity toward Protestants.'"

But now we will quote a passage from this very edition of Bancroft in which he declares that religious liberty and freedom of conscience did not spring, as has been supposed by some, from the official oath devised in 1648, but that religious liberty and freedom of conscience existed and were practiced and guaranteed to all sects long before that year, and in fact from the first arrival and foundation of the Maryland colony, in 1634, two years before Roger Williams devised his compact for the inhabitants of Providence, Rhode Island, by which they bound themselves "to be obedient to the orders of the majority *only in civil things*." The judgment of this historian especially, when expressed in his anti-Catholic edition of his *history*, ought to be conclusive on the subject of priority between Maryland and Rhode Island.

Now here is what Bancroft, referring to the years 1634–1635, says: "No sufferings were endured; no fears of want arose; the *foundations* of Maryland were peacefully and happily laid; and in six months it advanced more than Virginia had done in as many years. The proprietary continued with great liberality to provide everything needed for its comfort and protection, expending twenty thousand pounds sterling, and his associates as many more. *But far more memorable was the character of its institutions.* One of the largest wigwams was consecrated for religious service by the Jesuits, who could therefore say that the first chapel

of Maryland was built by the red men. *Of the Protestants, though they seem as yet to have been without a minister, their rights were not abridged. This enjoyment of liberty of conscience* DID NOT SPRING FROM ANY ACT OF COLONIAL LEGISLATION, *nor from any formal or general edict of the governor, nor from any* OATH *as yet imposed by instructions of the proprietary. English statutes were not held to bind the colonies, unless they especially named them; the clause which, in the charter for Virginia, excluded from that colony 'all persons suspected to affect the superstitions of the Church of Rome,' found no place in the charter for Maryland; and while allegiance was held to be due, there was no requirement of the oath of supremacy.* TOLERATION GREW UP IN THE PROVINCE SILENTLY AS THE CUSTOM OF THE LAND. *Through the benignity of the administration, no person professing to believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ was permitted to be molested on account of religion. Roman Catholics, who were oppressed by the laws of England, were sure to find an asylum on the north bank of the Potomac; and there, too, Protestants were sheltered against Protestant intolerance. From the first, men of foreign birth enjoyed equal advantages with those of the English and Irish nations.*"

This unquestionable authority shows that Maryland and Calvert were at the least two years prior to Rhode Island and Roger Williams in promising and practicing liberty of conscience. But following the first edition of Bancroft, fixing Roger Williams's compact in 1636, Lord Baltimore having planned his colony as a home for religious liberty at his conversion, 1624, Calvert was twelve years prior to Roger Williams. The charter of Avalon was dated on April 7, 1623, which was thirteen years prior to the foundation of Rhode Island, for Lord Baltimore, the year before his conversion, and in anticipation of it, planned the free settlement of Avalon. In 1632 the Maryland charter was granted, and this was four years before Rhode Island was founded by Roger Williams; and in 1633 the colony was organized, grants of land promised to settlers without distinction of creed, and the embarkation and departure from England took place, which was three years before Rhode Island was founded. The actual landing of the Maryland pilgrims at St. Mary's in 1634 gives Maryland and Calvert two years' precedence in establishing religious liberty over Rhode Island and Roger Williams. The instructions issued by Lord Baltimore in 1633 for the voyage which we have quoted, makes the priority three years. But the Maryland charter, 1632, makes the priority four years. We cannot better conclude this paper than by presenting three eminent authorities, all Protestant, in favor of the prior claim of Maryland—an historian, an annalist, and a jurist—Bancroft, Chalmers, and Judge Story.

George Bancroft, in his first and best edition of his "History of

the United States," says: "Calvert deserves to be ranked among the most wise and benevolent law-givers of all ages. He was the *first* in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice and not by the exercise of power; to plan the establishment of popular institutions with the enjoyment of *liberty of conscience;* to advance the career of civilization by recognizing the rightful equality of all Christian sects. The Asylum of Papists was the spot where, in a remote corner of the world, on the banks of rivers which, as yet, had hardly been explored, the mild forbearance of a proprietary adopted religious freedom as the basis of the State."

Chalmers, in his "Annals," adds his testimony to that of Bancroft. "He (Lord Baltimore) *laid the foundation* of his province upon the broad basis of security to property and of *freedom of religion*, granting, in absolute fee, fifty acres of land to *every* emigrant; establishing Christianity according to the old common law, of which it is a part, without allowing pre-eminence to any particular sect. The wisdom of his choice soon converted a dreary wilderness into a prosperous colony."

Mr. Justice Story, in his "Commentaries on the Constitution," said: "It is certainly very honorable to the liberality and public spirit of the proprietary that he should have introduced into his fundamental policy the doctrine of general toleration and equality among Christian sects (for he does not appear to have gone further), and have thus given the earliest example of a legislator inviting his subjects to the free indulgence of religious opinion. This was anterior to the settlement of Rhode Island, and therefore merits the enviable rank of being the first recognition among the colonists of the glorious and indefeasible rights of conscience."

Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.

THE VICAR-GENERAL.

ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF THIS OFFICE.

I.—Meaning of the word "vicar."—The office of vicar-general equivalently fulfilled either by the "chorepiscopi" or by priests in whom the bishops had put their trust.—First authentical trace of this institution in an exceptional disposition of the IV. Council of Lateran.—The archdeacons are definitively supplanted by the vicars-general during the thirteenth century.—Extension of the vicar-general's jurisdiction.—Voluntary and contentious jurisdiction.

II.—The cathedral chapter has, during a certain time, held a part with the bishop in the choice of the vicar-general.—The bishop alone choosing nowadays.—Is he obliged to have a vicar?—In certain cases Rome appoints immediately the vicar-general.—Although there is no precise obligation, nevertheless the use is universal.

III.—About the plurality of vicars-general.—Abuses of the "ancien regime."—The prelates, high lords and their staff.—Ambition of the young clergymen of noble birth.—The bishops disdained the advice of their chapter and had a counsel of vicars.—How Richelieu received the remarks of his vicars.—Plurality of vicars-general in certain countries to-day.—Legitimacy of that custom.—A bishop could not be obliged to have more than one vicar.—Powers of the co-vicars.

IV.—Mode of nomination.

THE general sense attached to the word "vicar" is admirably explained by the learned Jesuit Leurenius in his scholarly treatise, "De Episcoporum Vicariis." By vicars are understood those who are legimately appointed as vicegerents of an ecclesiastical superior with power to exercise the ministry or the jurisdiction in his name. "Vicarii dicuntur qui legitima auctoritate constituti sunt, ut episcopi alteriusve praelati, parochi, aut clerici, vices gerant in divinis ministeriis aut jurisdictione exercenda."[1] In fact, every one at the head of an important administration has need of a trustworthy substitute or vicar who can help him in the daily press of business and even replace him altogether in sickness or when absent.

Formerly the chorepiscopi (rural bishops) appear to have fulfilled duties something similar to our modern vicars-general; but it would be an historical absurdity to ascribe, as some authors

[1] Leurenius, *De Episcoporum Vicariis*, cap. i., p. 2.

have done, the same origin to both or to see in the office of the vicar-general a mere evolution of the office of the chorepiscopus. In former times bishops often selected clerics with whom they shared the task of administering their dioceses. Thus St. Gregory of Nazianzus[1] was prevailed upon by the solicitation of his venerable father, then bishop of Nazianzus, to leave the quiet retreat to which he had retired to perfect himself in sanctity, and become his assistant in the administration of the diocese. In the same way was St. Basil induced by Eusebius of Cæsarea[2] to render a like service to the Church. These were to a certain extent the prototypes of our modern vicars-general, as we now understand the term—a similarity which Thomassin very aptly notices in the comparison he establishes between these two saintly persons.[3]

These examples, taken from the Eastern Church, are by no means exceptions. St. Ambrose was aided in the administration of his extensive diocese of Milan by a Roman priest, Simplicius, who was sent by Pope St. Damasus, and who afterwards succeeded to the See of Milan. The relations of St. Augustine of Hippo with the Bishop Valerius[4] are well known, and important traces of an institution now become universal. We do not pretend to see in these examples a proof of any general discipline on the point or to maintain that canon law had then either traced its duties or fixed its obligations.[5] Besides being historically inaccurate, this would be neglecting to take into account the very important factors which played no uncertain part in shaping and moulding ecclesiastical law in this matter. Moreover, facts are opposed to such a theory. The decree of Gratian, as it is well known, never even refers to the vicar-general.[6] The decretals have

---

[1] Baronius, *Annales Eccles.*, ad. an. 371, No. 101. Nata. Alexander, *Hist. Eccl.*, sæc. iv., diss. xix., prop. iii., p. 401.

[2] Greg. Naz., in Oratione xliii.; in laudam Basilii. Migne, *Patrol. Gr.*, t. xxxvi., No. 790, 792. Baron., ad. au. 369, No. 45.

[3] "Magna inter utrumque, hunc Cæsareæ, illum Nazianzi generalem Vicarium affinitas, magna virtutum cognatio: cum enim esset uterque tum voluntariæ, tum contentiosæ administer jurisdictionis, episcopalem curam et laborem in se suscipiebant omnium."—Thomassinus, *Vetus et Nova Eccles. Discip.*, p. i., lib. ii., cap. vi., No. 3.

[4] Possidius, *Vita S. August.*, cap. iv. Migne, *Patr. Lat*, t. xxxii., p. 38

[5] "Fassen wir indessen die Stellung dieser Männer zu ihren Beschöfen nahe ins Auge, so wird sich leicht ergeben dass sie nur uneigentlich und in weitesten sinne des Wortes Generalvicare genannt werden können.—Kober, *Ueber den Ursprung und die Rechtliche Stellung der Generalvicare. Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1853, p. 536.

[6] The first allusion to officials of this kind appears in a letter of Innocent II., July 23, 1137. This Pope authorized the Bishop of Paris to delegate certain priests to help him in the discharge of his duties. He permitted these clerics to enjoy their benefices without being compelled to residence. We do not find any record of the title of vicar-general being taken by these ecclesiastics before the beginning of the fourteenth century.—Cf. Guérard, *Cartulaire de Notre Dame de Paris*, tom. i., pref. p. 108; tom. iii., 3, 123, 184; tom. ix., 54, 83, 196.

special articles treating of archpriests and archdeacons, an article on the functions of the vicar, "De Officio Vicarii;" but in all this there is no question of the clearly-defined matter which now occupies us;[1] although commentators treat about vicars-general under this rubric, "De Officio Vicarii." The first trace of this office appears in a wise dispensation of the Fourth Council of Lateran, intended to prevent or check in a diocese difficulties arising from the commingling of the faithful of different nationalities or of different languages.

Moved at the sight of so many race differences, the fathers assembled in the Lateran palace under the presidentship of Innocent III., determined to remedy the existing evils by the appointment of secondary or inferior administrators, who, while representing the bishop of the diocese and vested with his authority, should accomplish in his name and with his sanction the good which the bishop, alone and unaided, could not do. We give this important text in full, as it merits the attention both of the canonist and of the historian, on account of the part it played later on in the special legislation we are now considering: "Quoniam in plerisque partibus infra eandem civitatem atque diocesim permixti sunt populi diversarum linguarum habentes sub una fide varios ritus et mores, districtè praecipimus, ut pontifices hujusmodi civitatum sive diocesum, provideant viros idoneos, qui secum diversitates rituum et linguarum divina illis officia celebrent et ecclesiastica sacramenta ministrent instruendo verbo pariter et exemplo."[2]

Having settled this important point and duly provided for the daily administration of the sacraments and the ministry of the Word, the council next turned its attention to those possible conflicts and natural disagreements ever inseparable from the government of men, and added, so as to secure unity of direction and to prevent the formation of a double centre of authority in the same diocese, the vicar-general's duty of absolute obedience and subjection to the bishop: "Si . . . . urgens necessitas postulaverit, pontifex loci Catholicum praesulem nationibus illis, conformem providâ deliberatione constituat sibi vicarium in praedictis, qui ei per omnia sit obediens et subjectus."[3]

And here we may remark that there is question in the present instance of a necessity which cannot be satisfactorily met otherwise.[4] Later on this necessity will always be taken for granted, even when the needs which gave rise to it will exist no longer.

---

[1] Chap. "Sub Nobis" 5, title xxiii., lib. i., *Decret.*

[2] Cap. Quoniam, 14 tit. xxi., *De Officio Judicis Ordinarii*, lib. i., Decret.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] The bishops who were most exposed in administrative affairs had already, as we have seen, called to their assistance able and devoted co-operators. Leurenius, *loc. cit.*, p. 4, No. 59, mentions some later examples equally well known. "Erant tamen tunc in nonnullis diœcesibus vicarii-generales episcoporum quemadmodum Gildui-

The idea, however, of dependence and obedience to the bishop will ever remain unchanged and fundamental. The vicar-general is to form *one and the same person with the bishop*, and to act in perfect harmony with him. These two leading ideas appear to have moulded the whole legislation in reference to the office of the vicar-general. Long before this, the archdeacons exercised a similar duty near the bishop, but by degrees, owing to the negligence of superiors, or the action of various agencies[1] still unknown to us, the office of archdeacon assumed everywhere an overweening importance, and soon outgrew its usefulness,[2] and what was at first a simple delegation, depending entirely on the will of the bishop both for existence and for authority, became before long a regular title and benefice, from which there was no removal. To destroy this novel monopoly, a ready remedy was to create a rival authority to the archdeacons—an authority more pliable because revocable;[3] more powerful, because identical with the bishop's own authority, and exercised by one having the constant and immediate confidence of the ordinary. In this way the archdeacon was allowed to retain his official dignity, but he was gradually removed to a distance from the bishop. There his titles and his powers grew practically useless, and being so, they soon disappeared altogether.[4] The title *de officio vicarii* in 6°,[5] gives us an insight into

num Abbatem S. Victoris apud Parisios fuisse Vicarium Generalem Episcopi testatur Thomass. Item abbatem monasterii canonicorum Praemonstratensium ex antiquo usu esse Vicarium Episcopi Virdunensis."

[1] *Cf.* Isid. Hispa., *Epistol. ad Luitfred*, cap. i., § iii., dis. xxx. *Conci. Cabillon* ii., anno 813, cap. xv. Labbe, *Coll. Conc.*, t. xiv., p. 96. Hincm. Rhem., *Capit. Archid. data*, Migne, P. L., t. cxxv., p. 799, *et s.*

[2] St. Bernard refers to them in these very significant terms. "Sic sublimatum honoribus Ecclesiasticis, ut nec Episcopis inferior videatur, sic implicatum militaribus officiis ut praeferatur et ducibus."—*Epist.* 78, P. L. t. clxxxii., p. 198, No 11. Fulbert of Chartres is not less severe in speaking of his archdeacon. "Cum deberet esse oculus Episcopi sui, dispensator pauperum, catechisator insipientium apostavit ab omnibus et factus est quasi clavus in oculum, praedo pauperibus, dux erroris insipientibus, quinimo superba et contumeliosa dicta in Episcopum suum jaculatus est.—Fulb. Carnot. ad clerum Paris et 97, P. L. t. cxli., p. 248. M. Achille Luchaire in his learned *Manuel des Institutions Francaises*, gives expression to his opinion in the following terms: "The abuse of the archdeacon's powers soon brought about a series of troubles which agitated nearly every diocese. The archdeacon was in almost continual conflict (1) with the parishes and priories concerning the right of inspection and procuration; (2) with the cathedral chapters about the administration of vacant sees; (3) but especially was he at variance with the bishop, whose jurisdiction he called in question on every possible occasion, and diminished in every conceivable way."

[3] "Unde si quis aliter se ingesserit excommunicationis se noverit mucrone percussum, et si nec sic resipuerit ab omni ministerio Ecclesiastico deponendum, adhibito si necesse fuerit, brachio seculari ad tantam insolentiam repellendam."—*Cit. Cap.*, Quoniam.

[4] "Es ist eins der Mittel Gewesen, welches, dazu gedient hat die Macht der Archidiakonen zu brechen."—Hinschius *Das Kirckenrecht*, t. ii., p. 205. Kober, *loc. cit.*, p. 537.

[5] Cf. Thomass., *Vetu et nova Ecclesiæ. Disci.*, p. i., lib. ii., cap. viii., *seq.*—P. Fouruier, *Les Officialites au moyen age*, *passim.*

this quiet struggle, whose certain result is clearly indicated by the unfailing methods employed.

In the thirteenth century the contest was over, and the victory secure;[1] the dreaded power of the archdeacon was a thing of the past; the office of the vicar-general was clearly defined, and an admitted fact in the entire Church.[2]

Ferraris gives us an exact and close-fitting definition of the vicar-general as these conditions have made him. "Vicarii-generalis nomine," he tells us, "intelligitur ille qui constitutus est ab Episcopo cum generali potestate, ut ejus vices gerat in eodem loco in quo ipse sedem habet, ac jus dicere solet, ita ut censeatur idem esse auditorium utriusque."[3]

The vicar-general's ordinary jurisdiction extends, like the bishop's own (*a*) to the whole diocese.[4] Were it not so, he would be nothing more than a vicar forane, or rural dean, as Cardinal de Luca,[5] and the Archdeacon de Condom, Ducasse,[6] rightly remark; (*b*) to all cases of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, although a few special reservations may be made to the bishop, and so withdrawn from the vicar-general's jurisdiction.[7]

A bishop may, if he pleases, appoint two vicars, giving to one charge of the spiritual, and to the other charge of the material interests of the diocese. Although each one has unlimited jurisdiction in his own sphere of action, still custom and the traditions of the curia allow the first only to be called vicar-general, while the second is called œconomus. Unless the contrary be clearly stated, by vicar is meant *vicarius in spiritualibus*.[8]

Gradually, and at different epochs, a distinction, sanctioned by custom, began to be made between the vicar-general entrusted

---

[1] In 1298 Boniface VIII. published the liber vi., and reserved in it a special title to the vicar-general.

[2] "Zu Aufang des 13 Jahrhunderts ist es as Regel anzuschen das jeder Bischof vermittelst ausdrücklicher Vollmacht an seinem Bischofssitz einen Vertreter zur Ausübung der Juridiction bestellt, der, im Gegensatz zum Archidiakon mit ihm ein Tribunal bildet."—H. Laemmer, *Institutionem des katolischen kirchenrechts*, p. 264.

[3] Ferraris, *Prompt. Biblio.* voce *Vicarius.*

[4] Pirrhing, *loco. cit.*, No 7 —Laym ad. c. Romana *de officio Vicarii* in sexto.

[5] "Etiamsi ii qui in ipsa civitate deputantur foranei, vel speciales delegati dicuntur, quamvis generalis titulus, seu nuncupatio cum aliqua etiam delegatione universitatis causarum ei tribuatur, quoniam, erit quidem vicarius foraneus, sed cum aliqua majore prerogativa et jurisdictione quam regulariter hujusmodi vicariis competat."—De Luca, *ad Trident*, dist. ix., No. 5.

[6] "L'eveque communique (au grand vicaire) sa juridiction volontaire et gratieuse s'il la luy communique dans toute l'etenduë de son diocese, c'est son Vicaire general; sil ne la lui communique que dans un certain detroit, c'est son vicaire forain."—Ducasse, *La pratique et la juridiction Ecclesiastique* p. 14.

[7] To remove all grounds of dispute, the letters-patent usually specify the faculties the vicar-general has in the diocese.

[8] Sbrozzi, *Tractatus de officio et polestate Vicarii Episcopi*, l. i., q. 27, No. 1.

with matters pertaining to *voluntary* jurisdiction, and the vicar commonly called "official,"[1] entrusted with administering the *contentious* jurisdiction of the bishop. The vicar-general usually exercises this joint jurisdiction in the whole diocese; this is the more common practise, and seems more in harmony with the Council of Trent, which never speaks of episcopal vicars, but only of one[2]—the vicar-general. Later on we shall have occasion to remark how reluctant many bishops were to admit this interpretation, and in consequence they multiplied most unreasonably the number of their vicars.

* * * * *

According to the decisions of the Fourth Council of Lateran, the choice of the vicar-general rests with the bishop alone.[3] Notwithstanding, it is certain that it was not always so. During some time, the chapters took part in this nomination. Sbrozzi,[4] even in 1606, mentions this point of a primitive discipline. "Vicarius episcopi non sit a solo episcopo, sed cum consensu et auctoritate capituli, et sic ab universitate quae in capitulo et episcopo consistit." Now the contrary practise[5] is in vigor, and the choice rests with the bishop alone, a custom which is universally[6] observed. Hence, Leurenius and Sbrozzi conclude that the vicar-general's jurisdic-

---

[1] "Sciendum vero est ex cap. ult. h. tit. in 6° et ex praxi in aliquibus locis distinctum fuisse Vic. Generalem ab officiali Episcopi, cum illius auctoritas," versaretur in lis quae sunt voluntariæ jurisdictioni officialis vero præesse contentiosae et in negotiis forensibus vices Episcopi gereret: atque idem esset, qui olim dicebatur *missus Episcopi*. Cap. ii., De Reg. C. i., *De Fig. et Melaf. Glossa* ad c. ii. v.° officialem, *de officio Vic.* in No. 6°. Santi, *Prælectiones juris Canon*, tit xxxiii., p. 211, No. 17. Cf. Pragmaticam Episcopalium constitut. (1699) Epis[i]. Vratislav ap. Læmmer, *op cit.*, p. 268, No. 5, and P. Fournier, *Les officialites au Moyen Age*, p. 24.

[2] Bened. xiv., *De Synod. Dioces.*, lib. iii. Cap. iii., No. 2, " . . . . in aliquibus regionibus . . . . præsertim in Gallia, et Belgio, usus obtinuit ut ab officiali (V. G.) distinguatur, et "Vicarius," nuncupetur qui ea exercet quae sunt jurisdictionis voluntariæ; "officialis" vero, qui jurisdictioni præest contentiosæ . . . . apud nos autem unus et idem Episcopi vices in utriusque jurisdictionis exercitio genere consuevit; quod quidem esse juri conformius," etc.

[3] "Hæc facultas instituendi Vicarum generalem," as Santi says, *l. c.* p. 212, "primum concessa est Episcopis a Conc. Lat. iv. cujus dispositio refertur in c. 14, de offic. jud. ord. Necessaria autem fuit dispositio juris communis . . . . nam agebatur de novo officio instituendo cui generalis jurisdictio committeretur, ac locum et jura quemadmodum ingrederetur illius potestatis, qua Archidiaconus ex juris dispositione fruebatur."

[4] Sbrozzi, lib. ii., Qu. 55, No. 2.

[5] "If by chance the clergy oppose the bishop's choice, and refuse to accept the vicar-general he names, the S. Congregation usually favors the bishop, and obliges the clergy to submit.—*Analecta Juris Pontif.*, 1858, p. 915. Still it was not always so, and some years ago a certain French chapter opposed both vicars-general, and won its cause.

[6] Pirrhing ad tit *de officio Vicarii*, No. 28. Azor, *Instit Moral*, p. ii., lib. iii., Cap. 6. *et c.* 43 q. 2. Ferraris, *loc. cit*, p. 571. "Sic approbante praxi et consuetudine universali quæ in talibus est servanda."

tion is ordinary, not delegated. "Hodie episcopus non dat jurisdictionem, sed consuetudo cujus authoritate hodiè solus episcopus vicarium facit, et ideò vicarius olim à capitulo et episcopo, et sic ab universitate, et hodiè a consuetudine habet jurisdictionem et sic dicitur habere ordinariam."[1]

Authors do not agree as to the obligation of a bishop to appoint a vicar-general. In many decisions, the Rota openly favored the bishop's liberty of action, so that in theory, at least, this liberty has been advocated.[2] Pignatelli explains this jurisprudence by pointing out the close connection between the duties of the vicar-general and those of the procurator, and as the glossator in chap. ii., "De Proc.," remarks, no matter how different may be the affairs one has to treat, still he is never obliged to employ a procurator;[3] and again, those who, on account of certain special aptitudes, have a determined ecclesiastical charge assigned to them, should give it their personal attention.[4] In practise, however, it seems almost impossible for bishops to disregard the canonical aid which the Church places within their reach. Pirrhing,[5] and several other writers, too numerous to mention here, while denying any legal obligation compelling the bishop to appoint a vicar, or wishing in any way to fetter his liberty of action, distinguish the case in which the bishop is able to discharge all his episcopal duties without assistance, and when he is unable to do so. In the second case alone is he obliged to appoint a vicar-general.

Ducasse, whose name we have already mentioned, says that Fevret and other well-known authorities lay down several cases in which a bishop is bound to appoint a vicar-general. The first[6] is absence from the diocese; secondly, sickness or some other lawful[7] impediment; thirdly,[8] the existence of several dialects in the same diocese, etc.

The Congregation of bishops and regulars occasionally assumes

[1] Leurenius, *l. c.*, 13. We shall have occasion in another paper to examine the nature of this jurisdiction.

[2] Pignatelli, tom. 9. Cons. 105. A. No. 4. "Nullo jure cavetur quod Episcopus necessario teneatur habere vicarium juxta veriorem et magis communem sententiam, Gonzalez, *Glossema ad reg.* viii., *Concellariæ*, 4, No. 66. "Cum non teneatur habere vicarium seu officialem secundum veriorem opinionem quem tenet Rota." Engel ad tit. *de offic. Vic.*, No. 9. "Si Episcopus velit et sufficiat causas per se tractare, non potest cogi ad vicarium constituendum, quia ipsi Episcopo principaliter incumbit jurisdictio et exercitium ejus. Barbosa, Alleg. 54, No. 125. *Di Officio et potest. Epis* et in libr. i., *Juris Ecc.*, c. 15, No. 16. de Luca *Ann. ad Conc. Trid.*, disc. iv, No. 8.

[3] Pignatelli, *loc. cit.*, No. 7.

[4] Cap. iii., tit. iv., *De Clericis non residentibus*, lib. iii. Decret.; *Trid. Sess.* xxvi., cap. i. *De Reform.* Ferraris, *op. cit.* v. "electio," art. iii., No. 13.

[5] Pirrhing, ad tit. *de Off. Vic.*, No. 28

[6] Cap. ii., "Postulastis," tit. xxxiv., *De Voto*, lib. iii, Decretal.

[7] Cap. xv., "Inter Cætera." tit. xxxi., *De officio Jud. Ordin.*, l. i., Decr.

[8] Cap. xiv., "Quoniam," *eod. tit.*

the responsibility of imposing a vicar-general on a bishop who is found wanting in either theological knowledge[1] or judicial training, or administrative capacity[2]. This appointment does not give the vicar the title of vicar-apostolic, but if the congregation sees fit, he may continue to bear the name of vicar-general, although in official communications to the Roman tribunals, he should mention his delegation with apostolic faculties.

It is scarcely necessary to add that a vicar-general appointed by the Holy See holds his title and position independently of the ordinary, and in discharge of the special mission with which he is intrusted, he is not subject to episcopal authority.

Again, he cannot resign without the permission of the Congregation, but all his powers expire on the death of the bishop. In this principally is placed the chief difference between him and the vicar-apostolic, whose authority always remains in force until the newly appointed bishop takes actual possession of his see.

Leaving aside this exceptional case, we have to examine the general question and try to find out if it be admissible nowadays for a bishop, even in those small dioceses which have remained so much like the early Christian communities of the primitive church, no matter how highly gifted or talented he may be, no matter how easy he finds it to administer to every need and supply every want of his charge, in a word, is it right for a bishop blessed with health and science, zeal and activity, to dispense with the services of a vicar-general? We do not think it right or justifiable. With much greater reason does this hold good when there is question of the administration of extensive dioceses or flourishing churches whose ever urgent needs and wants claim attention and solicitude as much as their works of zeal require moulding, shaping and directing.[3] It may then be said, without fear of exaggeration, that the liberty given to bishops in the matter of dispensing with vicars-general is purely nominal, and that, in practice, they are always compelled by circumstances to act otherwise.[4] The uniform custom of the episcopacy is a proof and confirmation of this.

The popes, however, never exercised their authority to force

---

[1] *S. Congregation of Bishops and Regulars* in "Una Civitate Castell.," 2 April, 1591; "in Mediol," 8 February, 1594.

[2] The *Analecta Juris*, 1858, p. 906, give several examples of this procedure. In some cases the congregation asks the bishop to sign a blank nomination-paper, then over the bishop's signature is inserted the name selected by the congregation, or by the nuncio (or by the apostolic delegate, if there is one in the country), or even by the metropolitan.

[3] "Verum inspectis gravibus negotiis quæ persolvere debet episcopus, et variis occupationibus ministerii sacri quibus distrahitur, dici potest juxta sensum Cap. 15, *de off. et potes. Jud. Ord*, illum generaliter teneri." Santi, *op. cit.*, tom. i, p. 212.

[4] Rota, "in Calaguritana fructuum," 18 Martii, 1649. *S. Cong. Conc.*, 11 February, 1696.

bishops to any line of conduct in this matter. Pius IX. did not go further than to give a warm encouragement[1] to the bishops of the Rhenish provinces to appoint a vicar-general in each diocese in spite of the political and administrative reasons which made many of them hesitate and dread the consequences of such an action.

The compiler of the *Schema* for the Constitution "De Episcopis" prepared for the Vatican Council does not determine anything more accurately, but contents himself with a general statement bearing on the vicar-general's usefulness in expediting diocesan business. "Magni momenti in universæ diocesis negotiis expediendis est vicarii-generalis officium."[3]

Thus the projected decree which, on account of circumstances remained without any definite discussion, did not affirm any greater necessity for the vicar-general's office than what could be gathered from existing ecclesiastical laws. The motives for this course of action which we find in the notes or "adnotationes" added to the schema, appear to have been a certain hesitation in taking sides with one school of canonists in a disputed question of law, especially because the custom of appointing vicars was then practically universal in the Church. "Haud expedire visum est ut obligatio episcopis imponeretur vicarium generalem assumendi, qua quidem super re juris canonici interpretes in utramque partem disputant, præsertim vero quia nec præcepti necessitas apparet, quando plerique omnes episcopi vicarium generalem habent, ejusque opera utuntur. Placuit tamen, ut, commemorata utilitate quam vicarius generalis in universis dioceseos negotiis expediendis præstat, hujus retinendi opportunitas tacite innueretur."[4]

When may a bishop select his vicar-general? He may do so prior to his consecration but not before he takes possession of his see either in person or by procurator.

* * * * * *

Canon law usually favors the appointment of only one vicar-general, but, as we have said, this is often "more honored in the breach than in the observance." In some countries bishops have often several vicars at the same time. About the close of the late regime a very ridiculous custom became prevalent in France. The bishops, constantly recruited from the ranks of the nobility, dreading banishment from court, and fearing a life of seclusion in a far-off episcopal country-town, hit upon a very ingenious plan of robbing exile of its ennui by forming round them a circle of distinguished and honorable ecclesiastics, always chosen from mem-

[1] *Breve*, 6 Martii, 1851.

[2] Vogt. Kirchliche Verorderungen für das Bisthum Rottemburg (Rottemburg, 1863, p. 136). Hinchius, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

[3] *Collectio Lacensis*, xvii. Acta et decreta S. S. Concilii Vaticani, Appendix vi. Schema Constitutionis de Epis. et vicar general., Cap. vii, p. 645.

[4] *Ibid*, adnotationes ad Cap. vii., p. 650.

bers of their own kindred and often of their own family. Thus they kept on adding to the number of their vicars-general in a manner wholly uncalled for and entirely antagonistic to the spirit if not to the letter of canon law. A glance at a sort of ecclesiastical directory of this period, "La France Ecclesiastique," of 1789, will show us to what an extent this abuse was carried. There we see the Bishop of Troyes, Mgr. de Barral, with no fewer than seventeen vicars-general; the Bishop of Aix, Boigelin, with thirteen; Cicé, of Bordeaux, with fourteen; Clermont-Tonnerre, of Chalons, with eighteen; Durfort, of Besançon, sixteen; Marbeuf, of Autun, thirteen; Phelypeaux, of Bourges, eighteen; Rohan Guéméné, of Cambray, twenty; Royere, of Castres, thirteen; Talleyrand-Perigord, of Reims, sixteen, etc.! We have already given one of the reasons for this unusual and uncalled for number of vicars. Honored with high-sounding titles, entrusted by the confidence of the nation and the traditional glory of centuries with a large influence in public affairs, and occasionally, with a share in local administration, the bishops of the old school had a political prestige to maintain, which forced them to a display of show and worldly pageantry which we, in totally different circumstances, have great difficulty in imagining. If, on the one hand, the bishops were obliged to create this numerous staff, on the other hand, candidates, especially among young ecclesiastics of noble families, were ever eager to solicit admission into a body-guard so honorable, where advancement to the highest dignities was rapid and certain. Custom had even made the title of vicar-general an indispensable qualification for the episcopacy.

The following is given in a periodical, *Les Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques*, which though hostile and often ill-disposed, is still an inexhaustible mine of documentary information on historical matters bearing on the close of the old regime. There[1] we read that "the late king" (Louis XV.), "had in perfect good faith adopted the practice of nominating to vacant sees only those priests who had been vicars-general, taking it for granted that they had thus acquired a thorough knowledge of their priestly ministry and become familiar with the methods of governing a diocese. On that account, quite a number of young priests, fancying their birth and family connections give them a right to the episcopacy, hasten immediately after their ordination to secure the title of vicar-general. Many bishops are weak enough to gratify their wishes, and so these young priests remain in Paris attached to the court without performing any of their priestly functions or learning the duties of a state to which they are self-invited. The result of this abuse is, that a bishop who has in his diocese a sufficient number of vicars-general to help him and to share the task of governing, has also in Paris other

[1] An., 1780, p. 110.

priests, entire strangers to his diocese, who usurp a title wholly undeserved, and who are known as honorary vicars-general." It would, however, be unfair to form a judgment on this multiplicity of vicars-general founded exclusively on the too-often exaggerated attacks of the time. Circumstances must not be lost sight of. Diocesan chapters had long since ceased to be episcopal counsels. Who brought this about? On whom should this responsibility be fastened? It would be hazardous to venture on more than a suggestion in an ordinary article. On the one hand, very narrow views (not always foreign to great and otherwise illustrious corporations), and a jealous guarding and fencing in of acquired rights and privileges, joined to a forgetfulness of the higher interests of the diocese; and on the other, the changes effected by the concordat of Francis I., occasioned by the necessities of the epoch, and the new era which necessarily followed the changes for the episcopacy: all that would, if analyzed, account for this state of things. Again, the bishops felt the need of advisers and helpers, and the vicars-general could supply that need. Some bishops had the happy secret of drawing round them men of talent and of untiring devotion in the cause of Holy Church. Others, worldly men and courtly prelates, while religiously guarding, from their noble and essentially Christian training, a sentiment of duty on all important occasions, still forgot too often that the true lustre of the Pontiff is only preserved untarnished when freed from the gloss of worldly vanity. These reflections point out to us once more how the smallest infringement of church discipline is ever pregnant of evil consequences. This estrangement between the bishops and their chapters deprived episcopal authority of a much needed check. Sometimes, feeling themselves too isolated and too bereft of advice, the bishops strove to effect a remedy in the creation of a self chosen counsel. But how vain and limited is unaided human wisdom!

For one prelate like Fenelon, willing to listen to advice and to accept correction, how many hundred others could not brook the slightest contradiction nor accept the least suggestion? Richelieu, a man of extraordinary talent, a bishop of undoubted merit, whom the Abbé Lacroix, in a recent work,[1] shows to us, as filled with apostolic zeal and wise counsels at an age when ecclesiastics, are as a rule, employed in the most humble occupations—even Richelieu, was far from appreciating the wholesome monitions of his lieutenants at Luçon. See in what terms he writes to the vicars-general who had ventured to remonstrate with him. "You are my vicars-general, both of you," he writes; "as such your efforts should be to make everything harmonize with my wishes, provided God's glory be increased thereby. It would appear from your letter that you were out of temper when you wrote, and as person-

[1] *Richelieu à Luçon*, 1890.

ally, I am so great an admirer of my friends that I am only anxious to discover their good qualities, I think they should be careful not to show themselves to any disadvantage. If an insect has bitten you, kill it and do not try to communicate the poison to those who have escaped the sting. Thank God, I know how to govern myself and moreover, I know how my inferiors should govern themselves . . . . I see no harm in your telling me of any disorders in my diocese, but pray, do so calmly, knowing that any passion is calculated to irritate ardent temperaments like mine. You say, you are ready to resign the title I gave you. I made you vicars-general to oblige you, fancying you capable of being useful to the Church. If I was mistaken in doing so, if instead of pleasing you I grieved you, I am extremely sorry, but I can only remind you, that there is no disease without its remedy. I force my favors on no one . . . . I write to you not in the temper in which you wrote to me, but as a compliment to you. I try to model my style on yours."[1]

What a man of Richelieu's talent could hazard without injuring a good administration, many others without his ability or foresight would imitate to the great detriment of their diocese and annoyance of their clergy.[2]

Nowadays, the plurality of vicars-general is admitted in some countries. In France, for instance, the State recognises[3] and accords[4] a stipend to two vicars-general in each diocese, and to three in each arch-diocese, a practice which at first sight appears somewhat irregular. We must not, however, be too prompt to censure a system sanctioned by custom and approved by a pontifical indult. The possibility of the simultaneous existence of two vicars-general "*in spiritualibus*" in the same diocese is generally admitted by authors, though the multiplicity of procurators, curators and administrators, is considered irregular. The only condition required to make this exceptional state of things admissible

[1] Avenel, *Lettres de Richelieu*, t. i., p. 59.

[2] The substitution of a council of vicars-general for the bishop's canonical council had become so customary that the author of the civil constitution of the clergy, during the French Revolution, suppressed the chapters entirely, and replaced them by a new kind of ecclesiastical senate made up of the bishop's vicars-general, but the bishop was not so free as with those he had alone chosen. "Les vicaires des Eglises cathedrales," the law said, "les vicaires directeurs de séminaires, formeront ensemble le conseil habituel et permanent de l'évêque *qui ne pourra faire* aucun acte de juridiction en a qui concerne le gouvernement des diocêse et des séminare qu' aprés, en avoir delibérê avec eux."

[3] *Art. Organique*, No. 21. "Chaque évêque pourra nommer deux vicaires generaux, et chaque archévêque pourra en nommer trois."

[4] Decree of 22d January, 1853. "A compter du 1st Jan., 1853, les traitements des vic. généraux sout fixes ainsi qu'il suit." "Traitement du pr. vic. gen. de l'archevêque de Paris 4500 fr. traitement des deux antres v.-g. de l'archevêque des Paris et de prem. vic.-gener. des archevêques 3500 fr. Traitement des deux autres vic.-generaux des archeveq. et des vic. gen. des evéques, 2500 fr. Cf. ordonnance, 29th Sep., 1824.

is the recognition of an existing custom[1] arising either from the vast extent of the diocese, or the great number of the clergy or laity, or from a diversity of races or nationalities within the limits of the same episcopal jurisdiction.[2]

Notwithstanding all this, it seems to us much preferable and more conformable to the text of the law, for a bishop to confine himself to but one vicar-general, even in circumstances similar to those above mentioned. "Unity," as one of the compilers of the "Analecta"[3] remarks, "is perfectly consistent and reconcilable with all the needs of the largest diocese, seeing that the bishop is always free to appoint special delegates, who are not vicars-general in the canonical sense of the word, but who may have all the faculties and powers a bishop thinks necessary to give them. It was in this way that St. Charles Borromeo governed his extensive diocese, in which, as every one knows, he joined the most indefatigable zeal to the ablest management. Ferraris,[4] however, on the contrary, holds that bishops are entirely within their rights when they appoint two vicars, especially when the size or wants of a diocese suggest this course. "Maxime si diœcesis sit multum ampla, ut sic expeditioni causarum facilius consulatur, cum facilius expediantur causæ per plures quam per unum."

We may say then that where the custom is not established no bishop can be forced[5] to have more than one vicar-general, no matter how vast and how important his diocese may be, since, as we have shown, he can appoint vicars forane or rural deans to treat all matters of secondary importance.[6]

When it pleases a bishop to have two vicars-general, these two dignitaries are mutually independent of each other, in the sense that each one has his own proper powers and jurisdiction apart, and not subordinate to the other. Sometimes the bishop assigns to them some special duties in the discharge of which they are more responsible, but as a rule each one is answerable for all matters he treats, and as if he alone were vicar-general.[7] The habit of

[1] "Hae consuetudines," says Santi, p. 215 cognitae sunt legislatori supremo, et eas non reprobat, immo quandoque positive approbat, Romæ enim expediuntur litteræ apostolicæ "Episcopo et *vicariis* ejusdem in spiritualibus constitutis."

[2] The diocese of Münster has a vicar-general for the part situated in Oldenburg, and a vicar-general for the rest of the diocese. In the diocese of Breslau the same principle is maintained, the Russian part of the diocese having a vicar-general, the Austrian part having another. Cf. Vering *Lehrbuch des Katholischen Orientalischen und Protestantischen Kirchenrechts*, p. 596, No. 6.

[3] *Analet. Juris Pontif*, Au., 1867, p. 83. [4] Ferraris, *loc. cit.*, p. 571.

[5] "Cogi nequit Episcopus ad constituendum duos, tametsi ob dictam diœcesis amplitudinem ratione magnæ distantiae, asperitatisque viarum maximum subditorum resultaret incommodum, si in causis suis tam civilibus quam-criminalibus cogantur accedere ad locum tribunalis et residentiae episcopi ejusve ei assistentis vicarii generalis." Leurenius, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

[6] *Rota*, Dec., 537, No. 10, p. 4, Recent, tome, 3.

[7] Each of the three vicars-general in Paris has two days a week assigned to him for

referring business to a meeting of vicars-general acting collegialiter would not be conformable to canon law.

* * * * *

There is no special formula required for the vicar-general's appointment. Authors, however, supply a few set forms, which have no greater force or importance than the sanction of use. It is not necessary *per se* that the appointment should be made in writing; the only thing required is the intimation of the bishop's choice, but it is evident that letters of appointment should be drawn up in some convenient public form,[1] so as to obviate any difficulty in proving the vicar-general's powers, if they should be called in question.[2] In the early French Church the letters patent were drawn up in the following fashion. "The official instrument," says Ducasse,[3] "to be in good and due form, should be written out by the bishop's secretary, stamped with the official seal, attested to and signed by two reputable witnesses, who must not be relatives or dependents of the principals." Precautions are as necessary here as in the matter of the conferring of benefices.

Bishops now, generally use a formula varying a little in different dioceses, in which they enumerate sometimes briefly—sometimes at length, the various faculties of their vicars-general. In those countries, where by virtue of a concordat, an authorization of the government is needed, the bishop has, moreover, to secure that approval before proceeding to the nomination. Fortunately, the bishops of the United States have nothing to do with such a formality. The appointment of their vicar concerns only themselves.

Is it the very correct thing that they always appoint a priest of their diocese? Is it proper that a parish priest should fulfil that office? . . . . These, and many similar ones, are questions of the highest interest, but their multiplicity would extend this article beyond our limits, which at present, we have purposely circumscribed in the historical evolution and the nature of that important ecclesiastical office.

G. Peries, D D.

Catholic University, Washington.

purely business matters and for acting more directly in the name of the archbishop. Again, each has the special charge of one of the three archdiaconal territories (N. Dame, St. Genevieve, St. Denis). In addition to that, one has to look after all matters referring to interments, cemeteries. Another sees to the interests of the little seminaries, religion in the public schools, institutions and colleges. While the third looks after the hospitals, hospices and charitable institutions of the archdiocese.

[1] Dixi-Scriptura publica et solemni. Scriptura enim privata vel etiam publica sine solemnitalibus in ea requisitis non probatur vicariatus Episcopi."—Leurenius, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[2] "Die Ernennung des general Vikars erfolgt durch ein seine Befugnisse angebendes Decret aud wird amtlich publicirt, *um eine* Gefährdung der Rechtsicherheit innerhalb der diocese zu verhüten." H. Laemmer, *op. cit.*, p. 266. It is the application of the general principle "quod qualem quis se facit, talem debeat se ostendere."

[3] Ducasse, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

GLADSTONE'S HORACE.

THE ODES OF HORACE. Translated into English. By *W. E. Gladstone.* Charles Scribner's Sons: New York. 1894.

THE English have been styled "a nation of shop-keepers." In this view of their character, certainly their immemorial training has not been in vain. For with an unwavering gaze fixed on the "main chance," they have, like Mr. Pecksniff, succeeded, "with a hook in one hand and a crook in the other," in "scraping all sorts of valuable odds and ends into" their "pouch." But if they have thus become possessed of much of this world's goods, they redeem the misfortune somewhat by a large-handed liberality. They are perhaps the most unwearied travellers on the face of the earth; and this physical peculiarity of theirs is but symbolic of their intellectual progress through all the lands of thought. Palestine is yielding its hidden glories to the pickaxe and shovel of these alien delvers, just as, years ago, the long-buried historic sites of Babylonia, the Nile-mystery of Africa, and, long before that again, the far plains and mighty rivers of India, had already flung wide their portals to the British "Open, Sesame!" Philosophy, history, poetry, archæology, and a thousand other more or less attractive and familiar what-nots—all these are grist for their intellectual mill.

And so it has come to pass that the English tourist and classical antiquary, tracing out the foot-prints of ancient worthies, rests himself with many a sigh of grateful veneration in a little out-of-the-way corner of Italy, watered by the Licenza, a stream which, narrow and quiet in summer, becomes broad and turbulent in winter. From the Anio, into which it pours, trace back its course for some six miles to its source, and you arrive at a place in a well-watered valley, made famous forever as the Sabine Farm of Horace. The tourist will also arrive there (although by a different route) to enjoy the ecstacy of an endless Horatian suggestiveness. The name of this traveller is legion; and he is so unequivocally and almost exclusively English, that we shall scarce smile at the conviction of the peasants who, wrote Mr. Dennis, "believe Horace to have been an Englishman!"

But, as we have said, this geographic journeying is really symbolic of the much nobler quests of Englishmen in the realms of fact and fancy. The streams and founts, the hills and mountains, the cultivated fields and fallow meadows, Tivoli and Baiae, Lucre-

tilis and Licenza —all the haunts dear to the Roman lyrist, and endued with the common immortality of his verse, were already familiar scenes to the English traveller long ere his feet had journeyed toward their romantic and venerable sites. The schoolboy and the collegian had long before thumbed over and over again the dear pages of some well-worn little volume. Horace is the delight of youth and the solace of age. "Hooker escapes with him to the fields to seek oblivion of a hard life, made harder by a shrewish spouse. Lord Chesterfield tells us, 'when I talked my best, I quoted Horace.' To . . . . Wordsworth he is equally dear . . . . in Gibbon's militia days, 'on every march,' he says, 'in every journey, Horace was always in my pocket and often in my hand.' And as it has been, so it is." Thus Sir Theodore Martin, whose own love for Horace adds additional illustration to his statement.

England can furnish names made famous for ingenuity and research in every branch of Horatian literature. The vast labors of Bentley, his critical acumen, his ingenious suggestions, his painstaking and original (if at times faulty) textual emendations; the long catalogue of translators from the early times of Surrey and Sir Philip Sidney—names illustrious in the gradual transplanting of the Sonnet from Italy to England—down even to the present edition of Mr. Gladstone's; the biographical works of Milman and Martin; the clear and compressed commentaries of Macleane and Wickham; the innumerable school-editions and the varied scholastic apparatus designed to awaken and stimulate the interest of the student—all these add to the testimony of English men of letters the most conclusive proof that the "nation of shop-keepers" does not rest content with a mere material advancement.

But after the many admirable translations of Francis, Lord Lytton, Prof. Newman, Conington, Martin, Howes (and a host of others who have translated occasional odes, satires, epistles), we are rather surprised that the "Roman fever" should have found another opportunity to attack, in similar fashion, the greatest of England's statesmen. Semper ex *Anglia* aliquid novi.

In the presence of such a long and successful literary activity in this one field of Horatian translations, we might be tempted to inquire "*cui bono?*" when a new version appears. Mr. Gladstone asks substantially the same question in his Preface and answers it. But before hearing him, we may find in the very nature of the task which a translator sets before himself a large number of sufficiently available answers. For what is that task? It is, to act the part of an echo, to take the place of a mirror. Do we minimize the office and merits of a translation by these comparisons? For indeed an echo is but a faint replication of the parent sound,

it is but an *imago*, as the Latins beautifully and truthfully styled it. The air-waves that beat on the gateways to the brain and soul are but a remnant left after their comrades have vanished into the stillnesses of remote cliffs, it may be, or of the nearer ranges of heaping brick and stone. A divided chorus, their melody is weakened, their spirit is subdued. The image in the glass, like the *imago* of the sound, has also lost many of its fellow waves of light; and the eye catches but a partial glimpse of the real beauty of the object. Hardly better than such reflected images of things is a translation. It is the voice of the singer in proxy—a phonograph, if you will, but, like that instrument, lacking necessarily the delicate *nuances* of expression and emphasis, and, above all, of *timbre*, which alone are the distinguishing marks, not indeed so much of the singer, as of the finer phases of his personality. If this be true of elegant prose, which has been called "a good way of saying a good thing," how much more true is it of elegant poetry, which is "the best way of saying the best thing." But in *lyrical* poetry the highest difficulty is met. The melody of words, the finer shades of diction, the shy beauty, the passing gleams of light or tracks of shadow, the eluding fancifulness and play of imagery—let all these be fairly well caught and mirrored, and there is still left the deeper harmony of soul, the heart throbbings, the silent strength of the coursing life-blood, all of which nature has given to her best-beloved children as an inalienable heritage. If this be not true, then is the poet only an exquisitely skillful mechanician — like Hawthorne's "Artist of the Beautiful," whose long vigils and infinite pains at length attained their end in a mechanical butterfly, on whose gossamer wings you could see the soft down, in whose eyes you could catch a lustre that seemed instinct with spirit, in whose fluttering wings as it pursued its zigzag course through the air, you might almost fancy a larger life than that which pulses through its lazy fellows in the languorous air of summer noons; but whose marvellously delicate contrivances —a parody of the teeming life that seems a spontaneous growth accompanying that of flowers and grasses—crumbled into a hopeless heap of shining fragments in the grasp of an infant-hand.

If, then, the poet be something higher than the mere artist, it will require something better than a mere artist to echo his subtler harmonies, and to mirror forth his finer beauties. But, again, even the poet must condescend to play the part of an echo or a mirror, if he wishes to present a faithful image of the lyrist whom he translates. Otherwise shall we hear, not Horace, but Lytton, or Milton, or Dryden, or Gladstone. The translator, possess he never so poetic a soul, must be content to sink his own originality,

fancy, passion, sentiment, in the endeavor to seize, and fix, and reproduce, as far as may be, the thought and feeling of the Horatian original. Otherwise, the echo is confused, the image is blurred. Nevertheless, as we have already hinted, to do this is not to lessen the distinction or usefulness of the translator. For, if he succeeds even fairly in his office of echo or mirror, he has achieved a notable victory over a host of besetting difficulties. If the richest and most versatile accomplishments of translators seem to have presented in English almost a parody of Cicero's exquisite sonorousness, and dignity, and power of expression, how shall the *curiosa felicitas* of Horace be reproduced? If the large liberty of prose be tasked to its utmost, in the endeavor to give a strong idiomatic rendering in English of a strong idiomatic original in Latin, how shall the suggestiveness and coloring of happiest epithets in Horace find an English equivalent amid the hampering necessities of our rhyme and rhythm?

In this difficulty, therefore, we find a sufficient answer to the unthinking query, *cui bono?* What a single translator might not accomplish, becomes the aim of a multiplicity of translations, which, like the outlines of some majestic building caught by the artist from different standpoints, convey an idea of the beauty which cannot be condensed into a single picture. Such an apology was made by a very felicitous translator of the *Dies Iræ*—that monumental Hymn of the Ages—when he published a volume containing no less than thirteen versions from his own pen. He thus pleads in apology: "It has been the aim of the translator to be, in all cases, as faithful as possible to the sense and spirit of the original; and likewise to the letter, but not so slavishly as to preclude variety. He has endeavored to carry out likeness in unlikeness, and to give to each version, so far as practicable, the interest of a distinct poem. How far he has succeeded others must judge; . . . . there are some, if he mistakes not, who enjoy those pleasing surprises, in viewing an object, that result from an altered attitude and a new angle of vision—the curious changes which follow every fresh turn of a revolving kaleidoscope—and the writer is therefore willing to believe that such, at any rate, will not be displeased at this attempt to supply the deficiency of one version by another, and yet another, in the hope that thereby the original may be exhibited, approximately at least, in its solid entireness."[1]

And so it happens that we possess in the many translations of Horace, and particularly of Horace's Odes, a many-sided view of the original airy fabric of song. And the side-lights thus thrown

[1] *Dies Iræ*, in Thirteen Original Versions, by Abraham Coles, M.D., Ph.D., fifth edition, p. xxx.–xxxi.

on the metrical and poetic and rhythmic character of the Odes are in truth really illustrative and not fanciful. Of course, a verse which depends on quantity, and not on accent, cannot be fairly presented in English, but it may be imitated by a judicious selection and combination of metres, and of such syllables as even an ordinarily attentive ear would judge to be longer or shorter in English. Again, the same poetic instinct which led Horace to select certain forms of strophe for certain definite trends of thought, may very well be exercised in any language. But here no well-defined law indicates such selection, but rather that baffling instinct or sense of rhythm which is so peculiarly the native gift of the poet. Nor will this rhythmic sense choose amongst all peoples the same measure for the expression of the same thought or emotion. Thus, to Horace, the iambus, from its swift motion (*pes citus*, as he called it in the "Ep. ad Pison.") seemed principally significant of the rapid heats of anger,—*in celeres iambos misit furentem fervor* of Ode I., xvi., 24, which Mr. Gladstone well translates:

"In olden time
Fever heat within me burned,
Tempted, and my youthful prime
To those hot iambics turned."

Horace again alludes to his conception of the significance of this metre in the "Epis. ad Pison."—*iambo rabies Archilochum armavit* —armed him so well, indeed, that Lycambes and his daughters destroyed themselves, it is said, to escape the poisoned tips of his iambic darts. But in English the same metre has no special relation to satire or invective, nor, indeed, to any class of emotions —possibly because, being the easiest and most natural of all the metres for our English tongue, it has been used for the expression of all kinds of thought and feeling, and has been thus traditionally associated with the most diverse sentiments. Generally, indeed, far from being considered a *pes citus*, the iambic moves with graceful tardiness, and often even with a heavy solemnity. The play of the gentler emotions, the strong influence of the sublime, alike seek iambics for appropriate expression. In French, as in English, it is the dominant meter, and in both it has been specially consecrated to the office fulfilled of old by the hexameter, that

"stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man."

Without pursuing farther this suggestive inquiry, let us see what advantage Mr. Gladstone has sought in a diversity of rhythmic ministration. Mr. Conington had made it a fixed law for himself in his translation of the odes to render all the poems written in one metre by Horace into one metre in English; for he judged that identity in form should exist alike in the translations

and in the originals. But from what we have just said concerning the different and quite diverse uses of the same metre by different peoples—exemplified very strikingly by the iambics of Latin, English and French poetry—it will be readily seen that Mr. Conington had assumed as a basis of his law what is not strictly true. The sentiment which should find best rhythmic expression in Sapphics, for example, might also find best expression in English in, let us say, trochaics. But another quite diverse sentiment which should also seek best expression in Sapphics might not find an equally serviceable expression in English trochaics. The genius of the language and of its poetic structure is so different, the temperaments of Southron and Northerner interpret the same rhythms so differently, traditional usages have so altered the elder characteristics of verse, that no such definite law may be established as Mr. Conington postulated. Here must poetic instinct and feeling be the best judge. Discussing Mr. Conington's rule, Mr. Gladstone indicates very truly "two fundamental objections to this rule. The first is that the quantity of matter which the poet has given in the same forms of stanza is by no means uniform; and, if uniformity is to govern the translation, the space available for conveying what has to be conveyed will be sometimes too great and sometimes too small. There is another objection which lies yet nearer the root of the matter. Horace has in numerous cases employed the same metre for odes the most widely divergent in subject and character. Nothing, for example, can be farther apart in their spirit than Ode I., ix., suggested by the view of Soracte, and the great Ode of Regulus (III., v.), the loftiest in the whole collection. But these are both written in Alcaics. Again, the Ode on Hypermnestra may fairly be called heroic; while the ode addressed to Lydia in the First Book (xxv.) is amatory and in a high degree coarse. Yet both of them are Sapphic odes. Horace knew the capacities of his respective metres and how far he could make each of them elastic for particular varieties of use. But it does not follow that any one English metre, which the translator may have chosen for some one Horatian ode, will be equally supple and equally effective for conveying the spirit and effect of every other ode which Horace may have found it practicable to construct under the same metrical conditions. Every one of the odes, as a rule, has a spirit, genius and movement of its own; and we hold that the translator from Horace should both claim and exercise the largest possible freedom in varying his metres, so as to adapt them in each case to the original with which he has to deal. To adopt this rule is not really to relax the laws of his work, but only to improve the instrument with which he is to perform it."

Sir Theodore Martin, while claiming and freely exercising the right to vary at will the rhythms and stanza-forms of his translations, suggests another reason—the difficulty of locating delicately in any one English metre the intractable proper names of Latinity: "The form of verse into which each ode has been cast has been generally selected with a view to what might best reflect its prevailing tone. It has not always been possible, however, to follow this inclination, where, as frequently happens, either the names of persons or places, often most intractable, but always important, must have been sacrificed, or a measure selected into which these could be interwoven."

Bulwer constructs the strangest forms of stanza and verse; but he explains that readers who have thought his forms unrhythmic and unpleasant have come, after a re-perusal, to side more or less with his own doctrine. A strong contrast is found in the still vigorous version of Francis, whose use of iambic measures is almost unbroken and whose stanzas vary in construction but slightly from each other.

The contrast between the rhythms of Francis and of Bulwer is not more striking than that between the rhymeless verse of the latter and the tintinnabulation of rhyme in Francis, which becomes at last as familiar to the ear as the ticking of a clock. The question is immediately mooted: Should an unrhymed original be rendered into rhymed verse? The great names in poetic literature quoted in theory against the use of rhyme as puerile and undignified, useless and hampering, might also be quoted in practice (when, however, being actually poets, the divine frenzy might, perhaps, have unsettled their reason!) for the very opposite side of the question. The Greeks used no rhyme; the Latins, in their golden age, carefully avoided it, but in their silver age used it sparingly or, say rather, permitted its accidental occurrence; in mediæval Latin poetry, rhyme and accented metre quite supplanted the ancient forms. Hear Ben Jonson, in his "Fit of Rhyme Against Rhyme:"

> Greek was free from this infection;
> Happy Greek, by this protection,
> Was not spoiled;
> Whilst the Latin, queen of tongues,
> Is not yet free from rhyme's wrongs,
> But rests foiled.
> * * * * * *
> Vulgar languages that want
> Words and sweetness and be scant
> Of true measure,
> Tyrant rhyme hath so abused
> That they long since have refused
> Other censure.

But rare Ben condescended to rhyme even when translating from the rhymeless Latin, and his rhymes, harsh as they must often appear to the more exacting musical sense of our day, and exhibiting strong examples of the "heresy" known as "allowable" rhymes, we should prefer to have where they are, even with all their imperfections on their head. His "Intermissa Venus Diu," as altered by Mr. Martin to conform better to modern diction and rhyme, has really suffered in its attractive quaintness, but has undoubtedly gained in its rhymic features. Bulwer's and Gladstone's renderings of this ode are perfect contrasts in respect of metre and rhyme; but both are elegant versions, and may not be quoted for either side of the argument. The fact seems to be that in Bulwer's versions the ear is cheated into an apprehension of rhyme, just as in Collins' matchless "Ode to Evening"; but the art, sufficiently exquisite to accomplish this for once, must fail if thus exercised frequently—disappointment, rather than pleasurable surprise, is the dominant emotion called forth in the reader.

Milton, like Ben Jonson, has also been quoted against rhyme, and certainly his translation of the "Ode to Pyrrha" should seem to prove his sufficient apology. But surely this might well pass as an exception—*peperit semel sed leonem.* We could not spare, in his Nativity Hymn, the added beauty of rhyme. In this matter of rhyme, Mr. Gladstone follows the high standard of present-day usage. He thinks the translator "should severely limit his use of licentious and imperfect rhymes."

Leaving thus the question of rhyme, the Ode to Pyrrha just alluded to suggests the inquiry whether it would not be well to imitate, in so far as any of our English metres and stanza-forms might, the peculiar metres and strophes of Horace. To the lover of the Venusian bard, the very forms of his poems are pictures of beauty; they have gradually assumed features of added attractiveness from the many hours spent in the contemplation of their charms; they have gathered around them the thousand associations of boyhood and manhood, of student-life and world-life; their graceful structures have housed not alone the thoughts of Horace, but as well the fancies and feelings those thoughts have awakened in the heart of the reader. Could not these strophe-forms be imitated if not reproduced? Milton's imitation of the Alcaic stanza of the Ode to Pyrrha is an illustration in point. Quaintly beautiful as is his diction in this version, not less attractive is the very form of his verse, which brings back, by the easiest association of ideas, the rich rhythms of the original, the cameo-like setting of the thought, and, together with these, the very words of Horace. Original and translation are thus made to supplement each other; and whatever is lacking in literalness, or felicity of expression, or

subtle imaging of thought and fancy—and what version must not perforce lack some of these?—shall be supplied by an unconscious effort of imagination in the reader. Milton's version offers a close approximation to such a desirable similarity; but English metres can be made to do better work still. Tennyson, the master-workman of rhythm, showed us how this might be done, in his lines to Milton:

> Oh, mighty-mouthed inventor of harmonies,
> Oh, skilled to sing of time and eternity,
> God-gifted organ-voice of England—
> Milton, a name to resound for ages.

If Alcaics, quite difficult to imitate thus closely, can be made so melodious in English, what shall we say of the Sapphic—a metre only second to Alcaic in the esteem of Horace? The imitations of this in English are many, and in some cases very felicitous.

But just here, *àpropos* of Sapphics, a word of caution might not be amiss. There are two ways of reading a Sapphic verse: the *first*, which is the correct way, takes strict account of the succession of long and short syllables, and thus secures a stately dignity far removed from the tripping jingle of the *second*, which is the incorrect but the ordinary way of the plodding school-boy, who falls very naturally into the vulgar dactylic measure. We have seen in a work on versification the following quoted as an illustration of Sapphics in English:

> Never—ah me—now, as in days aforetime
> Rises o'erwhelming memory—'tis banished!
> Scenes of loved childhood, cannot ye restore time,
> Though it has vanished?

The jingle is as follows:

Rises o'er | whelming || memory, | 'tis ban | ished,

instead of the much more dignified flow in this close imitation (To Sappho in Sapphics):

> Maid of | Lesbos, | sad || is thy | lonely | island;
> Yea, in saddest gloom is the green of thy land;
> Thee thy maidens weep in the vale and highland—
> Weep I for *my* land!

It will be observed that the cesural pause is not happy in the above quotation; indeed, in few, if any, of the imitations we have come upon, is the full meaning of the Latin cesura apprehended. It is needless to point out first that it should occur after a syllable flowing over, as it were, into the third foot, from at least a dissyl-

labic word of the second foot; and secondly, that it should form a natural phrasal resting-place.

Other metres of Horace, notably the Asclepiadean, would present, perhaps, insuperable difficulties in the way of a happy imitation. But as the bulk of the metres in Horace are Alcaic or Sapphic, much at least could be accomplished in this matter. In the face of the many hampering necessities of such imitations, rhyme would probably be abandoned, and, indeed, could then be spared.

Mr. Gladstone has not attempted imitation in his metres. The work he set himself to do was surely arduous enough without any further embarrassment of rhythm than that which easy iambics might furnish: "The conditions of that work, if it is to be properly done are, as I view them, sufficiently severe. He (*i.e.*, the translator) should largely abridge the syllabic length of the Latin text; should carry compression to the farthest practicable point; should severely limit his use of licentious and imperfect rhymes; should avoid those irregularities in the use of the English genitive, which are so fatal to euphony, even though he find any of them supported by the authority of Shakespeare, for example in the line—

> Come, Cassius' sword, and find Titinius' heart.—*Julius Cæsar*, v., 3.

He should endeavor, with whatever changes of mere form, to preserve in all cases the sense and point of his author, and should sparingly allow the perilous but seductive doctrine of free translation. At the same time he must respect the genius of the English tongue, and aim at the easy flow of his numbers. With these purposes in his eye, he will find that he has no easy task in hand." In these words we have Mr. Gladstone's apology for offering a new translation of Horace: "Perhaps a serious, even if very imperfect, endeavor to attain these ends may excuse or warrant the addition made by this small volume to the existing translation of the Horatian Odes." But the requisite he seems to consider the most essential is that of *compression*. This is, indeed, the real purpose of his work. He thinks that Milton and Conington are almost alone in giving to this necessity an adequate share of attention. He thinks that "without compression, a translation from Horace, whatever its other merits may be, ceases to be Horatian; ceases, that is, to represent the original. It also ceases to represent the author, who, more perhaps than any writer among the ancients, has revealed his personality in his works; a personality highly interesting, and yet more signally instructive."

Mr. Gladstone very justly, we think, regards compression as of essential moment in any translation of Horace—the first of all Latin lyrists—whose chief excellence lies in *form* rather than in

thought, in art rather than in nature. Horace was a successful, but extremely laborious, artist. He did not emulate Pindaric flights nor allow himself the rich freedom of dithyrambs or of verses freed from the shackles of rule. His art was not even

> To vent new words, and measures pour
> Unheard before,

as Mr. Gladstone forcibly translates (iv., 2). His poems were not written for the throbbing pulse of the people—who did not exist—but for the fastidious and elegant culture of his imperial or lordly patrons. His presents to these shall be small, but they shall be highly-polished gems. His art was crystallization, and the translator who fuses the diamond in the crucible of his own soul must possess artistic chemistry enough to bring forth anew a stone highly polished and elegantly cut.

To have succeeded even fairly well in this task is to have overcome great difficulties, and to have rendered sufficient apology for a new volume of translations from Horace; and this Mr. Gladstone has done. We are tempted to quote largely in illustration, but must forbear. We have referred frequently to Milton's translation of the *Ode to Pyrrha*. He has reproduced the diamond so successfully that "no English translator of Horace," it has been said, "can ever pass this ode of his poet without dipping his colors to Milton as he goes by." Bulwer does not attempt a translation, but simply reprints Milton's version, with the remark that he "cannot presume to attempt any rhymeless version of this ode in juxtaposition with Milton's famous translation." So, too, Conington would not attempt, at first, a translation, but contented himself with reprinting Milton. Mr. Martin, who translated it in rhymed verse, did not attain the felicity of Mr. Gladstone's exquisite rendering. The attentive reader must immediately note how Milton's version is equalled in rhythm and surpassed in intelligibility by that of Mr. Gladstone.

It may be fairly assumed (as a corollary to the history of Horatian translations, and to the demonstration it furnishes of the impossibility of a perfect version) that in no single rendering can be reproduced more than a part of the original beauty. Paraphrases have been made which will stand a very favorable comparison with the originals, and may, indeed, be justly regarded as in reality superior poems. But the critic should always bear in mind that the principal merit—perhaps we should say *essential requisite* rather than *merit*—of any version is *faithfulness* to the original in meaning and sentiment. This is so essential as hardly to brook the name of merit. After this, the translators look at the original from different standpoints; and as all the other desirable elements

may not be secured in a single version, every translator is free to follow the bent of his own genius, the suggestion of his own taste, in his selection of metres, rhymes, rhythmic softness or ruggedness, phrasal extension or compression. Mr. Gladstone has laid especial stress on this last as essential in the endeavor to mirror the artistic mould of Horace's verse. This constitutes, probably, the grandest difficulty to be met with in translating Horace, but principally in those poems which contain many proper names. In the Sixth Ode of the First Book Mr. Gladstone indicates, in a footnote, the extreme difficulty he encountered in the fourth stanza; but for an illustration of this difficulty, and as an example of the varying views taken by translators of the necessity of compression, we prefer to select an ode which is singularly free from the embarrassment of proper names. This is the First of the Third Book—the grand *Odi profanum vulgus*. The metre is Alcaic—the stanza containing, therefore, three variant lines. Mr. Gladstone has, perhaps unfortunately, adopted a stanza consisting of four iambic tetrameters, and has lost, therefore, not a little of the rhythmic variety so striking in the original and so peculiarly fitted for halting the reader, as it were, at some sudden turn of the journey, which brings him face to face with a precipice of unexpressed surmise, or the sublime mountain-peak of some lofty conception, or it may be with some avalanche of Pindaric expression pouring down from that snowy peak

velut amnis, imbres
Quem super notas aluere ripas.

This great ode is a magnificently constructed portal to the solid and stately fabric of song in the Third Book. In this book, and particularly in the first series of odes, the exquisite art and diction of the Roman Lyrist shine forth in undimmed splendor. Some of these odes, indeed, Scaliger would place beside the work of Pindar himself, while of this First Ode he says: "*Magnifico dicendi genere structa est.*"

In strong contrast with the rather monotonous, but withal stately, stanzas of Mr. Gladstone, is the free Pindaric verse of Sir Theodore Martin. Hear his apology: "The Pindaric verse, introduced by Cowley, and carried by Dryden to perfection, has been adopted in translating this ode, the Fourteenth Ode of the Fourth Book, and the Secular Hymn, as the only measure in which the requisite freedom of movement could be attained for grappling with the originals. This verse—whilst in some respects it tempts to amplification—is favorable to closeness in others, inasmuch as the translator is not tied down, as in our ordinary stanza, to a regularly-recurring rhyme. Dryden, with his usual mastery of critical ex-

position, has said all that can be said of this noble form of verse: 'For variety—or, rather, where the majesty of thought requires it—the numbers may be stretched to the English heroic of five feet and to the French Alexandrine of six. But the ear must preside, and direct the judgment to the choice of numbers. Without the nicety of this, the harmony of Pindaric verse can never be complete. . . . .'" He thus translates the first stanza:

> Ye rabble rout, avaunt!
> Your vulgar din give o'er,
> Whilst I, the Muses' own hierophant,
> To the pure ears of youths and virgins chant
> In strains unheard before!

As usual, Bulwer employs the largest liberty, although he ekes out his stanza—wholly unembarrassed though he be by rhyme or by the cramping necessities of a formal metre—with a fourth line, which has no type in the original!

> I hate the uninitiate crowd—I drive it hence away;
> Silence while I, the Muses' priest, chant hymns unheard before;
> I chant to virgins and to youths,
> I chant to listeners pure.

Both of these versions exhibit a large liberty of expression. Very little, if any, attempt has been made in them to *compress* the English diction into Horatian limits. The opposite would rather seem to be the case in both; for while Horace completes his theme in forty-eight lines of the Alcaic stanza—a small compass—Bulwer uses the large build of the stanza just quoted, and finds it expedient to add to the words of the original (as in the fourth line of the extract quoted) in order to fill out his measure. On the other hand, Martin varies the stanza very considerably and constructs a metric form wholly dissimilar to that of Horace. With such freedom from the prison-house of a formal and invariable metre, we might well expect more compression in Martin than even Bulwer has succeeded in obtaining. But the reverse is the fact. The forty-eight lines of Horace are expanded into eighty-two in the translation. Manifestly, the crystal has been dissolved in the "water of crystallization." What was mere suggestion in Horace has been amplified into detailed statement; and while a closer connection of thought is thus made evident, and a blending of the rhythm of the stanza secured, the crisp statement and diction, the simple thought of the original, are too freely sacrificed. Mr. Martin's translation is unquestionably a sonorous and striking poem; but if compression be a virtue in a translation of Horace —if it be uniquely essential in an attempt to retain the cameo-like fineness of word-graving so peculiarly the artistic merit of

Horace—then can neither Martin nor Bulwer claim to have achieved a great success in their versions of this admirable ode.

Mr. Gladstone, on the contrary, has achieved here a very notable success. Without sacrificing rhyme or rhythm, without availing himself of the Pindaric liberty of metre and diction which Mr. Martin vindicated to himself, without making the verse grind its harsh consonantal elements against each other—he has translated not the thought alone, but as well the exquisite simplicity of diction and the crystalline sparkle of form. To quote a few stanzas:

Begone, vile mob, I bar my door,
Silence! the muses' priest, I bring
My gift: my strains unheard before,
To virgins and to youths I sing.

Kings firmly rule their subject realms,
But over kings Jove holds the rod;
The Giant brood he overwhelms,
And moves all nature with his nod.
* * * * *
The sword hangs bare o'er impious wrong:
For it, Sicilian cates will lack
Their dainty flavor, nor shall song
Of bird or lyre bring slumber back.

The gentle sleep that rustics know,
By choice frequents the humble cot;
Sweet Tempè's vale, where Zephyrs blow,
And shaded banks disdaining not.

Tempestuous seas need not appal
The measured craving of the wise;
Arcturus verging to his fall,
Or Kid-star at his gloomy rise.

Martin's version of

Sed Timor et Minae
Scandunt eodem, quo dominus, neque
Decedit aerata triremi et
Post equitem sedet atra Cura.

is very striking—much more impressive than Mr. Gladstone's, but much less condensed and much less faithful:

But let him climb in pride,
That lord of halls unblest,
Up to his lordly nest,
Yet ever by his side
Climb Terror and Unrest;
Within the brazen galley's sides,
Care, ever watchful flits,
And at his back when forth in state he rides,
Her withering shadow sits.

Mr. Gladstone's version is very literal; but, from the necessity of conforming to his original metre, it cannot lead up to such a fine climax as "Climb Terror and Unrest," nor imitate the antithesis between the dactylic galloping of the steed and the heavy and slow trochaic shadowing of Care; *Post equitem sedet atra cura*—a verse which, simple though it be, exhibits, in our opinion, perhaps the finest use of metre ever made by Horace in wedding sound to sense. Mr. Gladstone translates:

> But Fears and Threats can clamber fast
> As lords of land; in wealth's despite
> On beakèd yacht sits Care aghast,
> And rides behind the mounted knight.

No one who has not read Horace can enjoy fully even the best translation. He is the "untranslatable poet." And the judgment which will be passed on his merit must be very one-sided, and not very flattering, when it is based simply on translation, however felicitously done. In judging of the worth of any version, this fact must be taken into account. For no lover of the Lyrist's muse reads a translation either for its absolute beauty or its power of illustrating the original. Translations can, indeed, often give "a happy rendering, or an ingenious suggestion;" for a poet appreciates, not so much intellectually, as instinctively, the iridescence of fancy and sentiment, the quaint appropriateness of diction, the musical measures, the rhythmic sonorousness, the rugged virility or languorous softness of expression echoing appropriate emotions. And it is certain, on the other hand, that a mere intellectual analysis has not seldom caused the learned commentator to err egregiously in his interpretation of the scope and import of the poem. Still, it is not for such a side-light of fancy, such an illustration of happy diction, that a lover of Horace buys immediately and reads eagerly every new version of his favorite. He has known his friend too long to welcome the aid of a literary phrenologist to assist in estimating his character. It is to judge the translation by the original, rather than the original by the translation, that he welcomes the latest addition to the literature of Horace! Mr. Gladstone did not intend that his volume should serve as an "Introduction" to the study of Horace; and any criticism of that volume is hardly fair, which is disappointed at not finding in it a pleasant collection of English poems. The "compression" aimed at by Mr. Gladstone, while it should best illustrate the peculiarity of Horace, could not but defeat any striving after the graces of English verse. In addition to this, the mythologic references of Horace, *literally* translated, must seem Wagnerian mysticism to non-classicists. Other translators, by paraphrase and versified com-

mentary, have endeavored to render such references intelligible; but have only succeeded in writing practically original poems. Mr. Gladstone, on the contrary, translated, we assume, not for the vulgar herd of sciolists, but for Horatian scholars. No pedantic elucidations of the text are offered in prolegomena, foot-notes, or annotations. The reader of this volume is supposed to be a familiar of Horace and other ancient worthies:

> The bards sublime
> Whose distant footsteps echo
> Down the corridors of Time.

Occasionally a foot-note appears; but its purpose is not explanatory so much as apologetic—to indicate some special difficulty but partially overcome, some vulgar crudeness softened, some strange literalness vindicated. An example of this last is found in the fourth stanza of Book I., Ode xii.

> First comes the Parent's classic praise,
> Who seas, and earth, and seasons sways,
> And the vast All, with sovereign ken
> O'er gods and men.

He renders *parentis* literally, for the reason that "here only Jupiter is described in Horace by this word, which I have thought it well to preserve." Martin translates, "the world's great *sire*"—a needlessly amplificative phrase which is implied by the rest of the stanza; Bulwer has "*Father-King*"—the "king" being likewise implied in what follows; Christopher Pitt simply translates "*Jove*"—losing the fine suggestion of *parentis* which explains the reason of this power, the basis and character of the rule of the *Parens*.

After reading a number of extended versions of Horace it is pleasing to find a version which simply translates. The other extreme, namely, a very free paraphrase, such as Cowley's *Odi Profanum*, does not pretend to be a translation, and becomes at once an English poem whose merits are to be passed on without any reference to the original imitated. Either extreme—compression, or the largest amplification—is satisfying to the reader; the first, because it is what it claims to be—a translation; the second, because it also is what it claims to be—no translation at all. Very wisely, we think, has Mr. Gladstone avoided the rock on which so many other translators have split—the attempt to dress up in modern finery the classic simplicity of the old diction; the desire to make "poetic" poetry out of a rather prosy original. For be it known that very much of Horace's excellence lay in his artistic manipulation of metres in which he was not "to the manner born."

Deep feeling he not only did not pretend to, but (with a few exceptions) formally and expressly avoided. His diction was not meant to be anything else than clear-cut and highly polished, suggestive rather than full, elegant rather than rich, refined rather than enthusiastic. But the whole trend of our modern English poetry is at complete variance with such a type. Depth of sentiment, enthusiasm of expression, not a little mysticism and star-embracing idealism,—these to-day form our poetic dress which, if we should extend to the poetic realm Carlyle's "Philosophy of Clothes," might soon point the moral of the age we live in—the age of that sovereignty of the *people* which Horace's epoch did not know. The modern poets no longer form the clientèle of some lordly patron to whose "hours of ease" they might minister a not over-stimulating pleasure. On the contrary, they strive, with what success they may, to formulate the dreamings and schemings, the dim intuitions and vague longings, of the large heart of humanity. And so it has come to pass that the best attempts to popularize Horace in translation have failed. The old too often masquerades under the trappings of the new; and the reader experiences the weariness of stage-properties where he expected to find living men and women. Francis's version is still a favorite for the very reason that he did not attempt to capture with glittering tinsel and gaudy frippery. Bulwer errs by adopting a blustering style of metres which, we feel sure, while it affects the lover of Horace with the same sense of strangeness and awkwardness which Horace's own metres would cause in the mind of the *profanum vulgus*, fails of its imitative design; for it neither reproduces the metres familiar to the Horatian student, nor offers to the "uninitiate crowd" a pleasing substitute for those rhythms which transfigured Alcaeus and Sappho of old, and which afterwards amid the *dilettante* culture of Augustan Rome, leveled at their successful transplanter the admiring fingers of the passers-by. Martin, too, attempts to make absolute English poems of a poetry which has no affinity with ours. He improves on the original both in diction and in sentiment, and draws dangerously near to "poetic" poetry. But this is really not Horace, but Martin; and whatever rank Horace held amongst his contemporaries, certainly Sir Theodore did not pretend to amongst our latter day poets. Horace in translation will please no public except the academic public. And this class, if it desire English poetry, will turn for all that is best in it to Tennyson, or Wordsworth, or Lowell, or Browning. It welcomes translations, not for their own merit, but because of their relationship to the dear old Epicurean whose homely views of life, rather than his natural ethics and philosophy, have approved themselves, like the proverbs of the peoples, to the experience of all

men, and all ages, and all climes. This public will easily grow weary of any pompous disquisition on the morality of the comfortable old pagan whose whole theology and philosophy was comprised in the "golden mean" of natural likes and dislikes. It cares not for his gods and goddesses, his imperial patron, his high-living associates—not even for those natural beauties made famous in his verse, except in so far as they give "a local habitation and a name" to his "airy nothings." Whatever of poetic fancy there is in his mythology it will tolerate graciously enough; but what it seeks first is the companionship of the man himself who, a freedman's son, could win the affection of a Mæcenas, and the esteem of an Augustus. Its hero was a pagan, and not a Christian. It recognizes this thoroughly, and reads everywhere between the lines the sadness of a soul that must bid an eternal *Ave et Vale* to its dead half, its loved Mæcenas. But the homely truths of experience, resting not on a supernatural but on a natural basis in this pagan's philosophy, it finds crystallized into gem-like phrases which have become coin current in all literatures. And so, despising the basis of his ethics, it can see not a little truth in his exposition of the poetry of life. What merit shall such a public as this require in a translator? Mr. Gladstone's answer is the best—*compression*, and *not* amplification; *literalness*, and *not* paraphrase; delicacy, and *not* depth; simplicity, and *not* grandeur.

In vain, we conclude, shall Horace appeal in translation to the sympathies of any but a Horatian audience. Our modern "University Extension" scheme of pouring doses of classical information into minds that are wholly unequal to the task of assimilating it properly, is happily exploded at last. Imagine the young gentlemen and young ladies of to-day discussing—*through translation!*—the merits of Horace at their afternoon teas! Mr. Gladstone has been accused, in harsh terms, of not having written versions of Horace which might be classed as English poems. We think his apology is found in the truth we have been trying to illustrate in the foregoing remarks. He wrote for old lovers and familiars of the Venusian Singer, *habitués* of his house, companions at his table. These needed no introduction to their genial host of the Sabine Farm; these do not care to discuss his religion, his mythology, his morality, his sparkling conversation, his dignified familiarity with patrons of his muse, or any other of the thousand literary topics suggested by his name to the amateur critics at five o'clock teas; these have known him too long to feel any vanity of acquaintanceship, or to publish their own acquirements by discussing his; these will regard Mr. Gladstone's book as the latest tribute alike to the excellence of their bard, and to the wide culture of his eminent translator. Gratified with the patronage of his illus-

trious name and the example of his life-long admiration, they will again pick up the well-worn volume which can suggest so many more things that it contains; which is an epitome of their earliest scholastic efforts, a record of their maturer reflections,an elegant expression of life's experiences. Again shall "Ustica's upland vale," pleasant Lucretilis, and Digentia's "gelid stream," banish from their eyes the smoke of the city, and from their ears the dismal tumult of its denizens. Again shall the "cheap Sabine wines" gather a goodly company around the festal board; or if haply it be the Kalends of March,

> This day shall burst
> The amphor's seal, and taste the juice
> Under Consul Tullus first
> Seasoned in the smoke for use.

Mæcenas will then be present, to "quaff cups a score," and then will "burn the torches till the day." In the accompanying flow of soul they shall hear, indeed, the affectionate raillery which flatters while it cures, but

> "No scandal while you dine
> But honest talk and wholesome wine,
> And only hear the magpie gossip
> Garrulous, under a roof of pine."

And ever and anon shall come up from the dreamy page a picture of the gray hairs but sturdy form of a second Mæcenas, the minister of a gentler Cæsarism than that of old, the patron of letters at once and of a higher life still than that of literature—the Grand Old Man whom the peoples have learned to love, while their princes were fain to cherish.

H. T. Henry.

St. Charles' Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.

THE ENCYCLICAL.

VENERABILIBVS FRATIBVS
ARCHIEPISCOPIS ET EPISCOPIS
FOEDERATARVM AMERICAE SEPTENTRIONALIS CIVITATVM.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES
SALVTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

LONGINQUA oceani spatia animo et cogitatione traiicimus: et quamquam vos allocuti alias scribendo sumus, maxime quoties ad episcopos catholici orbis communes litteras pro auctoritate dedimus, modo tamen affari vos separatim decrevimus, hoc videlicet consilio ut prodesse aliquid catholico nomini apud vos, Deo volente, possimus. Idque summo studio curâque aggredimur: propterea quod et plurimi facimus et magnopere diligimus americanum, validum iuventâ, genus: in quo plane non civilis tantummodo, sed christianae etiam rei cernimus animo incrementa latentia.

Exitum quarti ab explorata America saeculi cum tota gens vestra haud multo ante gratâ recordatione atque omni significatione, ut erat dignum, concelebraret, Nos item auspicatissimi facti memoriam vobiscum recoluimus communione laetitiae et similitudine voluntatis. In illoque tempore vota quidem pro incolumitate et magnitudine vestra absentes fecisse, haud satis habuimus: in optatis erat coram, aliqua ratione, vobis adesse gestientibus: ob eam rem libentes, qui gereret personam Nostram, misimus.

Quae vero in illa celebritate vestra fecimus, non iniuria fecimus: quia americanum genus, vix editum in lucem ac prope vagiens in cunis, sinu amplexuque suo Ecclesia parens excepit. Quod enim alias datâ operâ demonstravimus, navigationum laborumque hunc in primis fructum Columbus petiit, aditum christiano nomini per novas terras novaque maria patefacere: qua in cogitatione constanter inhaerens, quibuscumque appulsus oris, nihil habebat antiquius, quam ut Crucis sacrosanctae simulacrum defigeret in littore. Quapropter sicut arca Noetica, exudantes supergressa fluctus, semen vehebat Israelitarum cum reliquiis generis humani, eodem modo commissae oceano Columbianae rates et principium magna-

rum civitatum et primordia catholici nominis transmarinis oris invexere.

Quae postea consecuta sunt, non est huius loci singula persequi. Certe repertis ab homine Ligure gentibus, etiam tum agrestibus, evangelium maturrime illuxit. Satis enim est cognitum quot e Franciscana familia, item ex Dominicana et Loiolaea, duobus continentibus saeculis, istuc navigare huius rei gratiâ consueverint, ut deductas ex Europa colonias excolerent, sed in primis et maxime ut ad christiana sacra indigenas ex superstitione traducerent, consecratis non semel cruento testimonio laboribus. Nova ipsa oppidis vestris compluribus et fluminibus et montibus et lacubus imposita nomina docent perspicueque testantur Ecclesiae catholicae vestigiis vestras penitus impressas origines.—Neque illud fortasse sine aliquo divinae providentiae consilio factum, quod heic commemoramus: cum americanae coloniae libertatem ac principatum, adiuvantibus hominibus catholicis, adeptae, in rempublicam coaluere iure fundatum, tunc apud vos est ecclesiastica hierarchia rite constituta: et quo tempore magnum Washingtonum ad gubernacula rei publicae admovit populare suffragium, eodem pariter tempore auctoritate apostolica primus est Americanae Ecclesiae episcopus praepositus. Amicitia vero consuetudoque familiaris, quam alteri cum altero constat intercessisse, documento videtur esse, foederatas istas civitates concordiâ amicitiâque coniunctas esse Ecclesiae catholicae oportere. Neque id sane sine caussa. Non enim potest nisi moribus bonis stare res publica; idque acute vidit edixitque primarius ille civis vester, quem modo nominavimus, in quo tanta fuit vis ingenii prudentiaeque civilis. Sed mores bonos optime et maxime continet religio quippe quae suapte naturâ principia cuncta custodit ac vindicat ex quibus officia ducuntur, propositisque ad agendum momentis maximis, iubet cum virtute vivere, peccare vetat. Quid autem est Ecclesia aliud, nisi societas legitima, voluntate iussuque Iesu Christi conservandae morum sanctitati tuendaeque religioni condita? Hanc ob rem, quod saepe ex hoc pontificatus fastigio persuadere conati sumus, Ecclesia quidem, quamquam per se et naturâ suâ salutem spectat animorum, adipiscendamque in caelis felicitatem, tamen in ipso etiam rerum mortalium genere tot ac tantas ultro parit utilitates, ut plures muioresve non posset, si in primis et maxime esset ad tuendam huius vitae, quae in terris degitur, prosperitatem instituta.

Progredientem rem publicam vestram atque in meliorem statum volucri itinere venientem, nemo non vidit: idque in iis etiam rebus quae religionem attingunt. Nam quemadmodum ingenti commodorum potentiaeque accessione, unius conversione saeculi, crevere civitates, ita Ecclesiam cernimus ex minima tenuissimaque magnam perceleriter effectam et egregie florentem. Iamvero si ex

una parte auctae opes copiaeque civitatum merito americani generis ingenio atque operosae sedulitati referuntur acceptae; ex altera florens rei catholicae conditio primum quidem virtuti, sollertiae, prudentiaeque tribuenda Episcoporum et Cleri: deinde vero fidei munificentiaeque catholicorum. Ita singulis ordinibus pro virili parte adnitentibus, licuit vobis res innumerabiles pie atque utiliter instituere; aedes sacras, ludos litterarios pueris instituendis, domicilia maiorum disciplinarum, domos hospitales plebi excipiundae, valetudinaria, coenobia. Quod vero propius ad culturam attinet animorum, quae christianarum exercitatione virtutum continetur, plura Nobis comperta sunt, quibus et spe erigimur et gaudio complemur: scilicet augeri gradatim utriusqae ordinis Clericos: in honore esse pia collegia sodalium, vigere scholas *curiales catholicas*, scholas *dominicas* doctrinae christianae tradendae, scholas *aestivas;* consociationes ad suppetias mutuo ferendas, ad inopiam levandam, ad victus temperantiam tuendam: his accedere multa pietatis popularis argumenta.

Harum felicitati rerum non est dubium plurimum iussa ac decreta conducere Synodorum vestrarum, earum maxime, quas posteriore tempore Sedis Apostolicae vocavit et sanxit auctoritas. Sed praeterea, libet enim id fateri quod est, sua debetur gratia aequitati legum, quibus America vivit, moribusque bene constitutae rei publicae. Hoc enim Ecclesiae apud vos concessum est, non repugnante temperatione civitatis, ut nullis legum praepedita vinclis, contra vim defensa iure communi iustitiâque iudiciorum, tutam obtineat vivendi agendique sine offensione facultatem. Sed quamquam haec vera sunt, tamen error tollendus, ne quis hinc sequi existimet, petendum ab America exemplum optimi Ecclesiae status: aut universe licere vel expedire, rei civilis reique sacrae distractas esse dissociatasque, more americano, rationes. Quod enim incolumis apud vos res est catholica, quod prosperis etiam auctibus crescit, id omnino fecunditati tribuendum, qua divinitus pollet Ecclesia, quaeque si nullus adversetur, si nulla res impedimento sit, se sponte effert atque effundit; longe tamen uberiores editura fructus, si, praeter libertatem, gratiâ legum fruatur patrocinioque publicae potestatis.

Nos vero, quoad per tempora licuit, conservare ac fundare firmius rem catholicam apud vos, numquam praetermisimus.—Hac de caussa duas potissimum res, quod probe nostis, aggressi sumus: alteram, provehere studia doctrinarum: alteram, rei catholicae efficere administrationem pleniorem. Scilicet etsi universitatis studiorum domicilia plura numerabantur, eaque insignia, faciendum tamen duximus, ut unum aliquod existeret Sedis Apostolicae auctoritate institutum, idemque omni iure legitimo a Nobis auctum; in quo doctores catholici studiosos sciendi erudirent, prin-

cipio quidem philosophicis ac theologicis, deinde vero, ubi res et tempora siverint, ceteris quoque disciplinis, iis nominatim quas nostra aut peperit aut perfecit aetas. Omnis enim eruditio manca sit, si nulla recentiorum disciplinarum accesserit cognitio. Videlicet in hoc tam celeri ingeniorum cursu, in tanta cupiditate sciendi tam late fusa, eademque per se laudabili atque honesta, anteire decet catholicos homines, non subsequi: ideoque instruant se oportet ab omni elegantia doctrinae, acriterque exerceant animum in exploratione veri, et totius, quoad potest, indagatione naturæ. Quod omni tempore idem Ecclesia voluit: ob eamque rem ad proferendos scientiarum fines omnino tantum conferre consuevit, quantum opera et contentione potuit. Igitur per litteras die VII Martii an. MDCCCLXXXIX ad vos, Venerabiles Fratres, datas Gymnasium magnum cupidae maiorum disciplinarum iuventuti rite constituimus Washingtoni, in urbe principe; quam quidem peropportunam fore sedem studiis optimis, vosmetipsi maximo numero significastis. De qua re ad venerabiles fratres Nostros S. R. E. Cardinales cum referremus in Consistorio,[1] velle Nos declaravimus, legis instar eo in gymnasio haberi, ut eruditio et doctrina coniungatur cum incolumitate fidei, neque minus ad religionem quam ad artes optimas informentur adolescentes. Idcirco rectae studiorum rationi, ac disciplinae alumnorum tuendae praeesse iussimus foederatarum civitatum Episcopos, collata Archiepiscopo Baltimorensi Cancellarii, ut loquuntur, potestate ac munere.—Et initia quidem, Dei beneficio, satis laeta. Nulla enim interiecta mora, cum saecularia sollemnia ob memoriam ecclesiasticae Hierarchiae ageretis, exorsae faustis ominibus, praesente Legato Nostro, sacrae disciplinae. Ex eoque tempore elaborare novimus in tradenda theologia spectatos viros, quorum ingenii doctrinaeque laus insigni erga Sedem Apostolicam fide observantiâque cumulatur.—Neque vero diu est, cum rescivimus, pii sacerdotis liberalitate extructas ab inchoato aedes scientiis litterisque tradendis, clericorum simul et laicorum commodo adolescentium. E cuius viri exemplo facile confidimus sumpturos, quod imitentur, cives: non enim ignota Nobis indoles Americanorum; neque fugere eos potest, quidquid in ea re collocetur liberalitatis, cum maximis in commune utilitatibus compensari.

Ex huiusmodi Lyceis, quae variis temporibus Ecclesia romana aut ipsamet princeps instituit, aut instituta probavit legibusque auxit, nemo est nescius quanta in omnem Europam et doctrinæ copia et vis humanitatis effluxerit. Hodieque, ut sileamus de ceteris, satis est Lovaniense meminisse: ex quo universa Belgarum gens incrementa petit prosperitatis et gloriae prope quotidiana.

[1] Die XXX. Decembr. an. MDCCCLXXXIX.

Iamvero par ac similis copia utilitatum facile est a magno Lyceo Washingtoniensi consecutura, si doctores pariter atque alumni, quod minime dubitamus, praeceptis Nostris paruerint, iidemque, amotis partium studiis et contentionibus, opinionem sibi a populo, a Clero conciliarint.

Caritati vestrae, Venerabiles Fratres, ac beneficentiae populari commendatum hoc loco volumus Collegium urbanum adolescentibus ex America septentrionali ad sacra fingendis, quod Pius IX. decessor Noster condidit, quodque ipsum Nos, per litteras die XXV. Octobri mense an. MDCCCLXXXIV. datas, constitutione legitima firmandum curavimus: eo vel maxime quod communem de ipso expectationem haud sane fefellit exitus. Testes estis vosmetipsi, non longo temporis decursu, complures inde extitisse sacerdotes bonos, in iisque nec deesse qui maximos sacrae dignitatis gradus virtute adepti doctrinaque sint. Quare vos omnino arbitramur facturos operae pretium, si perrexeritis lectos adolescentes huc mittere in spem Ecclesiae instituendos: quas enim et ingenii opes et animi virtutes in romana urbe paraverint, eas aliquando explicabunt domi, atque in communem afferent utilitatem.

Simili modo vel inde a Pontificatus exordio caritate permoti, qua catholicos e gente vestra complectimur, de Concilio Baltimorensi III. cogitare coepimus. Cumque serius Archiepiscopi, eius rei caussâ, Romam invitatu Nostro istinc advenissent, diligenter ab ipsis, quid in commune consulendum censerent, exquisivimus: postremo quod universis Baltimoram convocatis visum est decernere, id matura consideratione adhibita, ratum esse auctoritate apostolica iussimus. Celeriter autem apparuit operae fructus. Quandoquidem Baltimorensia consulta, salutaria et valde accommodata temporibus res ipsa comprobavit, comprobat. Satis iam eorum perspecta vis est ad stabiliendam disciplinam, ad excitandam Cleri sollertiam ac vigilantiam, ad catholicam adolescentis aetatis institutionem tuendam et propagandam.—Quamquam his in rebus si vestram, Venerabiles Fratres, agnoscimus industriam, si collaudamus iunctam cum prudentia constantiam, merito vestro facimus: propterea quod plane intelligimus, talium ubertatem bonorum nequaquam ad maturitatem tam celeriter atque expedite perventuram fuisse, si vosmetipsi, quae sapienter ad Baltimoram statueratis, ea non sedulo et fideliter exsequi, quantum in sua quisque potestate erat, studuissetis.

Verum absoluto Baltimorensi concilio, reliqua pars erat ut congruens et conveniens quasi fastigium imponeretur operi: quod impetrari vidimus vix posse melius, quam si Apostolica Sedes legationem americanam rite constituisset; eam itaque, ut nostis, rite constituimus. Atque hoc facto, quemadmodum alias docuimus, primum quidem testari placuit, in iudicio benevolentiaque

Nostra eodem Americam loco et iure esse, quo ceterae sunt, praesertim magnae atque imperiosae, civitates. Deinde illud quoque spectavimus, ut officiorum et necessitudinum, quae vos, quae tot hominum millia catholicorum cum Apostolica Sede continent, fierent coniunctiora nexa. Revera multitudo catholicorum rem a Nobis peractam intellexit, quam sicut saluti sibi sentiebat fore, ita praeterea in more positam institutoque Sedis Apostolicae cognoverat. Videlicet romani Pontifices, ob hanc caussam quod rei christianae administrandae divinitus tenent principatum, suos peregre legatos ad gentes populosque christianos mittere vel ab ultima antiquitate consueverunt. Id autem non extrinsecus quaesito, sed nativo iure suo, quia "romanus Pontifex, cui contulit Christus potestatem ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes ac singulas Ecclesias, sive in omnes et singulos Pastores et fideles,[1] cum personaliter singulas regiones circuire non possit, nec circa gregem sibi creditum curam pastoralis sollicitudinis exercere, necesse habet interdum *ex debito impositae servitutis*, suos ad diversas mundi partes, prout necessitates emerserint, destinare legatos, qui *vices eius supplendo*, errata corrigant, aspera in plana convertant et commissis sibi populis salutis incrementa ministrent."[2]

Illa vero quam iniusta et falsa suspicio, si qua foret uspiam, demandatam Legato potestatem potestati officere episcoporum. Sancta Nobis, ut nulli magis, eorum iura sunt, quos *Spiritus sanctus posuit episcopos regere Ecclesiam Dei*, eaque permanere integra in omni gente, atque in omni regione terrarum et volumus et velle debemus: praesertim quod singulorum dignitas episcoporum cum dignitate romani pontificis ita naturâ contexitur, ut alteri necessario consulat, qui alteram tueatur. *Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesiae. Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tum ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.*[3] Quare Legati Apostolici, qualicumque demum potestate augeatur, cum haec persona atque hae partes sint, Pontificis a quo mittitur, mandata facere et voluntatem interpretari, tantum abest ut ordinariae potestati episcoporum quicquam pariat detrimenti, ut potius firmamentum ac robur sit allaturus. Eius quippe auctoritas non parum est habitura ponderis ad conservandam in multitudine obedientiam; in Clero disciplinam debitamque Episcopis verecundiam; in Episcopis caritatem mutuam cum intima animorum coniunctione.—Quae quidem tam salutaris tamque expetenda coniunctio, cum in hoc potissimum sita sit et sentire concorditer et agere, plane efficiet, ut quisque vestrum in administratione rei dioecesanae suae diligenter versari pergat: nemo alterum in re-

[1] Conc. Vat. Sess. iv., c. 3.
[2] Cap. un Extravag. Comm., *De Consuet.*, l. I.
[3] S. Gregorius, *Epist. ad Eulog.*, Alex. lib. viii., ep. 30.

gundo impediat; de alterius consiliis actisque nemo quaerat; universique, sublatis dissidiis retinendâque invicem observantiâ, provehere Ecclesiae americanae decus et commune bonum summa virium conspiratione nitamini. Ex qua Episcoporum concordia dici vix potest quanta non modo salus in nostros manabit, sed et in reliquos vis exempli; quippe qui facile vel hoc ipso argumento perspicient in Episcoporum catholicorum ordinem vere divinum apostolatum hereditate transisse.—Est praeterea aliud magnopere considerandum. Consentiunt prudentes viri, quod nosmetipsi paulo ante indicavimus, nec sane inviti, reservatam ad maiora Americam videri. Atqui huius, quae prospicitur, magnitudinis participem eamdemque adiutricem Ecclesiam catholicam volumus. Nimirum ius esse atque oportere iudicamus, eam una cum republica pleno gradu ad meliora contendere, utendis videlicet opportunitatibus, quas afferat dies: eodemque tempore dare operam, ut virtute institutisque suis prosit quam maxime potest incrementis civitatum. Sed omnino utrumque est tanto facilius cumulatiusque consecutura, quanto constitutam melius futura tempora offenderint. Iamvero quid sibi vult legatio, de qua loquimur, aut quid spectat tamquam finem, nisi hoc efficere, ut Ecclesiae sit constitutio firmior, disciplina munitior?

Quod ita cum sit, valde velimus hoc in animos catholicorum quotidie altius descendat, nec sibi privatim consulere se posse rectius, nec de salute communi melius mereri, quam si Ecclesiae subesse atque obtemperare toto animo perrexerint.

Quamquam hac illi in re vix indigent hortatione: solent enim sua sponte et laudabili constantia ad instituta catholica adhaerescere. Rem unam eamque maximi momenti et saluberrimam in omnes partes libet recordari hoc loco, quae fide moribusque sancte apud vos, uti aequum est, generatim retinetur: dogma christianum dicimus de unitate et perpetuitate coniugii: in quo non societati dumtaxat domesticae, sed etiam coniunctioni hominum civili maximum suppeditat vinculum incolumitatis. De civibus vestris, de iis ipsis qui nobiscum cetera dissident, catholicam hac de re doctrinam catholicumque morem non pauci mirantur ac probant videlicet perterriti licentia divortiorum. Quod cum ita iudicant, non minus caritate patriae ducuntur, quam sapientiâ consilii. Vix enim cogitari potest capitalior civitati pestis, quam velle, dirimi posse vinculum, divina lege perpetuum atque individuum. Divortiorum "caussâ fiunt maritalia foedera mutabilia: extenuatur mutua benevolentia: infidelitati perniciosa incitamenta suppeditantur: tuitioni atque institutioni liberorum nocetur: dissuendis societatibus domesticis praebetur occasio: discordiarum inter familias semina sparguntur: minuitur ac deprimitur dignitas mulierum, quae in periculum veniunt ne, cum libidini virorum inservierint, pro

derelictis habeantur. Et quoniam ad perdendas familias, frangendasque regnorum opes nihil tam valet quam corruptela morum, facile perspicitur prosperitati familiarum ac civitatum maxime inimica esse divortia."

De rerum genere civili, compertum est atque exploratum, in re publica praesertim populari, cuiusmodi vestra est, quanti referat probos esse ac bene moratos cives. In libera civitate, nisi iustitia vulgo colatur, nisi saepius ac diligenter ad evangelicarum praecepta legum multitudo revocetur, potest ipsa esse perniciosa libertas. Quotquot igitur ex ordine Cleri in erudienda multitudine elaborant, hunc locum de officiis civium enucleate pertractent, ut id persuasum penitusque comprehensum animo habeant universi, in omni munere vitae civilis fidem praestari, abstinentiam, integritatem oportere: quod enim privatis in rebus non licet, id nec in publicis licere. De hoc genere toto in ipsis encyclicis litteris, quas in Pontificatu maximo subinde conscripsimus, complura, ut nostis, praesto sunt, quae sequantur et quibus pareant catholici. Libertatem humanam, praecipua christianorum officia, principatum civilem, civitatum constitutionem christianam scribendo edisserendoque attigimus, depromptis cum ex evangelica doctrina, tum ex ratione principiis. Qui igitur esse cives probi volunt et in officiis suis cum fide versari, facile sumant ex litteris Nostris formam honestatis.—Simili modo insistant sacerdotes Concilii Baltimorensis III statuta ad populum meminisse: ea maxime quae de virtute temperantiae sunt, de catholica adolescentium institutione, de frequenti sacramentorum usu, de obtemperatione iustis legibus institutisque reipublicae.

De ineundis quoque societatibus, diligentissime videndum ne quis errore fallatur. Atque hoc intelligi nominatim de opificibus volumus: quibus profecto coire in sodalitia, utilitatum sibi comparandarum gratiâ, ius est, libente Ecclesia, nec repugnante natura: sed vehementer interest, quibuscum sese coniungant, ne ubi rerum meliorum adiumenta requirunt, ibi in discrimen vocentur bonorum multo maximorum. Huius discriminis maxima cautio est ut secum ipsi statuant, numquam commissuros ut ullo tempore ullâve in re iustitia deseratur. Si qua igitur societas est, quae a personis regatur non recti tenacibus, non religioni amicis, eisque obnoxie pareat, obesse plurimum publice et privatim potest, prodesse non potest. Maneat ergo, quod consequens est, non modo fugere consociationes oportere, Ecclesiae iudicio aperte damnatas, sed eas etiam, quae prudentium virorum maximeque Episcoporum sententiâ, suspectae periculosaeque habeantur.

---

[1] Enc., *Arcanum.*

Imo vero, quod est valde ad fidei incolumitatem conducibile, malle catholici debent cum catholicis congregari, nisi fieri secus coegerit necessitas. Sibi vero inter se societate conglobatis praeesse sacerdotes aut laicos probos atque auctoritate graves iubeant: iisque consilio praeeuntibus, consulere ac perficere pacate nitantur quod expedire rationibus suis videatur, ad normam potissimum praeceptorum, quae Nos litteris encyclicis *Rerum novarum* consignavimus. Hoc vero numquam sidi patiantur excidere, vindicari et in tuto poni iura multitudinis rectum esse atque optabile, verumtamen non praetermittendis officiis. Officia vero permagna ea esse, aliena non tangere; singulos esse sinere ad suas res liberos; quominus operam suam collocare queat ubi libet et quando libet, prohibere neminem. Quae per vim et turbas facta superiore anno vidistis in patria, satis admonent americanis etiam rebus audaciam immanitatemque perduellium imminere. Ipsa igitur tempora catholicos iubent pro tranquillitate contendere rerum communium, ideoque observare leges, abhorrere a vi, nec plura petere quam vel aequitas vel iustitia patiatur.

Has ad res multum sane conferre operae possunt, qui se ad scribendum contulere, maxime quorum in commentariis quotidianis insumitur labor. Haud latet Nos, multos iam in hac palaestra desudare bene exercitatos, quorum laudanda magis est, quam excitanda industria. Verumtamen legendi noscendique cupiditas cum tam vehemens sit apud vos ac tam late pertineat, cumque bonorum iuxta ac malorum maximum possit esse principium, omni ope enitendum, ut eorum numerus augeatur, qui scribendi munus scienter atque animo optimo gerant, religione duce, probitate comite. Atque id eo magis apparet in America necessarium propter consuetudinem usumque catholicorum cum alienis catholico nomine: quae certe caussa est quamobrem nostris summa animi provisione constantiâque singulari sit opus. Erudiri eos necesse est, admoneri, confirmari animo, incitari ad studia virtutum, ad officia erga Ecclesiam, in tantis offensionum caussis, fideliter servanda. Ista quidem curare atque in istis elaborare, munus est Cleri proprium idemque permagnum: sed tamen a scriptoribus ephemeridum et locus et tempus postulat, idem ut ipsi conentur, eademque pro caussa, quoad possunt, contendant. Serio tamen considerent, scribendi operam, si minus obfuturam, parum certe religioni profuturam, deficiente animorum idem petentium concordia. Qui Ecclesiae servire utiliter, qui catholicum nomen ex animo tueri scribendo expetunt, summo consensu, ac prope contractis copiis oportet dimicare: ut plane non tam repellere, quam inferre bellum, si qui vires discordiâ dissipant, videantur.—Non absimili ratione operam suam ex frugifera et fructuosa

in vitiosam calamitosamque scriptores convertunt, quotiescumque consilia vel acta episcoporum ad suum revocare iudicium ausint, abiectâque verecundiâ debitâ, carpere, reprehendere: ex quo non cernunt quanta perturbatio ordinis, quot mala gignantur. Ergo meminerint officii, ac iustos modestiae fines ne transiliant. In excelso auctoritatis gradu collocatis obtemperandum Episcopis est, et conveniens consentaneusque magnitudini ac sanctitati muneris habendus honos. Istam vere reverentiam, "quam praetermittere licet nemini, maxime in catholicis ephemeridum auctoribus luculentam esse et velut expositam ad exemplum necesse est. Ephemerides enim ad longe lateque pervagandum natae, in obvii cuiusque manus quotidie veniunt, et in opinionibus moribusque multitudinis non parum possunt."[1] Multa multis locis Nosmetipsi de officio scriptoris boni praecepimus: multa item et a Concilio Baltimorensi III., et ab Archiepiscopis qui Chigagum anno MDCCCLXXXIII. convenerant, de communi sententia sunt renovata. Huiusmodi igitur documenta et Nostra et vestra habeant notata animo catholici, atque ita statuant, universam scribendi rationem eisdem dirigi oportere, si probe fungi officio volunt, ut velle debent.

Ad reliquos iam cogitatio convertitur, qui nobiscum de fide christiana dissentiunt: quorum non paucos quis neget hereditate magis, quam voluntate dissentire? Ut simus de eorum salute solliciti, quo animi ardore velimus ut in Ecclesiae complexum, communis omnium matris, aliquando restituantur, Epistola Nostra Apostolica *Praeclara* novissimo tempore declaravit. Nec sane destituimur omni spe: is enim praesens respicit, cui parent omnia, quique animam posuit ut *filios Dei, qui erant dispersi, congregaret in unum.*[2] Certe non eos deserere, non linquere menti suae debemus, sed lenitate et caritate maxima trahere ad nos, omnibus modis persuadendo, ut inducant animum introspicere in omnes doctrinae catholicae partes, praeiudicatasque opiniones exuere. Qua in re si episcoporum Clerique universi primae sunt partes, secundae sunt laicorum: quippe quorum in potestate est adiuvare apostolicam Cleri contentionem probitate morum, integrate vitae. Exempli magna vis est, in iis potissimum qui veritatem ex animo anquirunt, honestatemque propter quamdam virtutis indolem consectantur, cuiusmodi in civibus vestris numerantur perplures. Christianarum spectaculum virtutum si in obcaecatis inveterata superstitione ethnicis tantum potuit, quantum litterarum monu-

[1] Ep. *Cognita Nobis* ad Archiepp. et Epp. Provinciarum Taurinen. Mediolanen. Vercellen. XXV. Ian. an. MDCCCLXXXII.

[2] Io. XI., 52.

menta testantur, num in iis, qui sunt christianis initiati sacris, nihil ad evellendum errorem posse censebimus?

Denique nec eos praetermittere silentio possumus, quorum, diuturna infelicitas opem a viris apostolicis implorat et exposcit: Indos intelligimus et Nigritas, americanis comprehensos finibus, qui maximam partem nondum superstitionis depulere tenebras. Quantus ad excolendum ager! quanta hominum multitudo partis per Iesum Christum impertienda beneficiis!

Interea caelestium munerum auspicem et benevolentiae Nostrae testem, vobis Venerabiles Fratres, et Clero populoque vestro, Apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum die VI. Ianuarii, Epiphania Domini, An. MDCCCXCV., Pontificatus Nostri decimo septimo.

LEO PP. XIII.

TRANSLATION OF THE ENCYCLICAL.

To Our Venerable Brethren the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States of North America, Leo XIII., Pope.

Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction:

We traverse in spirit and thought the wide expanse of ocean; and although we have at other times addressed you in writing—chiefly when we directed Encyclical letters to the bishops of the Catholic world—yet have we now resolved to speak to you separately, trusting that we shall be, God willing, of some assistance to the Catholic cause amongst you. To this we apply ourself with the utmost zeal and care; because we highly esteem and love exceedingly the young and vigorous American nation, in which we plainly discern latent forces for the advancement alike of civilization and of Christianity.

Not long ago, when your whole nation, as was fitting, celebrated, with grateful recollection and every manifestation of joy, the completion of the fourth century since the discovery of America, we, too, commemorated together with you that most auspicious event, sharing in your rejoicings with equal good will. Nor were we on that occasion content with offering prayers at a distance for your welfare and greatness. It was our wish to be in some manner present with you in your festivities. Hence we cheerfully sent one who should represent our person. Not without good reason did we take part in yonr celebration. For when America was, as yet, but a new-born babe, uttering in its cradle its first feeble cries, the Church took it to her bosom and motherly embrace. Columbus, as we have elsewhere expressly shown, sought, as the primary fruit of his voyages and labors, to open a pathway for the Christian faith into new lands and new seas. Keeping this thought constantly in view, his first solicitude, wherever he disembarked, was to plant upon the shore the sacred emblem of the Cross. Wherefore, like as the Ark of Noe, surmounting the overflowing waters, bore the seed of Israel together with the remnants of the human race, even thus did the barks launched by Columbus upon the ocean carry into regions beyond the seas as well the germs of mighty states as the principles of the Catholic religion.

This is not the place to give a detailed account of what there-

upon ensued. Very rapidly did the light of the Gospel shine upon the savage tribes discovered by the Ligurian. For it is sufficiently well known how many of the children of Francis, as well as of Dominic and of Loyola, were accustomed during the two following centuries to voyage thither for this purpose; how they cared for the colonies brought over from Europe; but primarily and chiefly how they converted the natives from superstition to Christianity, sealing their labors in many instances with the testimony of their blood. The names newly given to so many of your towns and rivers, and mountains and lakes, teach and clearly witness how deeply your beginnings were marked with the footprints of the Catholic Church.

Nor, perchance, did the fact which we now recall take place without some design of Divine Providence. Precisely at the epoch when the American colonies, having, with Catholic aid, achieved liberty and independence, coalesced into a constitutional Republic the ecclesiastical hierarchy was happily established amongst you; and at the very time when the popular suffrage placed the great Washington at the helm of the Republic, the first bishop was set by apostolic authority over the American Church. The well-known friendship and familiar intercourse which subsisted between these two men seems to be an evidence that the United States ought to be conjoined in concord and amity with the Catholic Church. And not without cause; for without morality the state cannot endure—a truth which that illustrious citizen of yours, whom we have just mentioned, with a keenness of insight worthy of his genius and statesmanship, perceived and proclaimed. But the best and strongest support of morality is Religion. She, by her very nature, guards and defends all the principles on which duties are founded, and, setting before us the motives most powerful to influence us, commands us to live virtuously and forbids us to transgress. Now, what is the Church other than a legitimate society, founded by the will and ordinance of Jesus Christ for the preservation of morality and the defence of religion? For this reason have we repeatedly endeavored, from the summit of the pontifical dignity, to inculcate that the Church, whilst directly and immediately aiming at the salvation of souls and the beatitude which is to be attained in heaven, is yet, even in the order of temporal things, the fountain of blessings so numerous and great that they could not have been greater or more numerous had the original purpose of her institution been the pursuit of happiness during the life which is spent on earth.

That your Republic is progressing and developing by giant strides, is patent to all; and this holds good in religious matters also. For even as your cities, in the course of one century, have

made a marvelous increase in wealth and power, so do we behold the Church, from scant and slender beginnings, grown with rapidity to be great and exceedingly flourishing. Now, if, on the one hand, the increased riches and resources of your cities are justly attributed to the talents and active industry of the American people, on the other hand, the prosperous condition of Catholicity must be ascribed, first, indeed, to the virtue, the ability and the prudence of the bishops and clergy; but, in no slight measure also, to the faith and generosity of the Catholic laity. Thus, while the different classes exerted their best energies, you were enabled to erect unnumbered religious and useful institutions, sacred edifices, schools for the instruction of youth, colleges for the higher branches, homes for the poor, hospitals for the sick, and convents and monasteries. As for what more closely touches spiritual interests, which are based upon the exercise of Christian virtues, many facts have been brought to our notice, whereby we are animated with hope and filled with joy, namely, that the numbers of the secular and regular clergy are steadily augmenting, that pious sodalities and confraternities are held in esteem, that the Catholic parochial schools, the Sunday-schools for imparting Christian doctrine and Summer schools are in a flourishing condition; moreover, associations for mutual aid, for the relief of the indigent, for the promotion of temperate living, add to all this the many evidences of popular piety.

The main factor, no doubt, in bringing things into this happy state, were the ordinances and decrees of your Synods, especially of those which in more recent times were convened and confirmed by the authority of the Apostolic See. But, moreover (a fact which it gives pleasure to acknowledge), thanks are due to the equity of the laws which obtain in America and to the customs of the well-ordered Republic. For the Church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and Government of your nation, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals, is free to live and act without hindrance. Yet, though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced. The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself; but she would bring forth more abundant

fruits, if in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.

For our part we have left nothing undone, as far as circumstances permitted, to preserve and more solidly establish amongst you the Catholic religion. With this intent, we have, as you are well aware, turned our attention to two special objects; first, the advancement of learning; second, a perfecting of methods in the management of Church affairs. There already, indeed, existed several distinguished universities. We, however, thought it advisable that there should be one founded by authority of the Apostolic See and endowed by us with all suitable powers, in which Catholic professors might instruct those devoted to the pursuit of learning. The design was to begin with philosophy and theology, adding, as means and circumstances would allow, the remaining branches, those particularly, which the present age has introduced or perfected. An education cannot be deemed complete which takes no notice of modern sciences. It is obvious that in the existing keen competition of talents, and the widespread and, in itself, noble and praiseworthy passion for knowledge, Catholics ought to be, not followers, but leaders. It is necessary, therefore, that they should cultivate every refinement of learning, and zealously train their minds to the discovery of truth and the investigation, so far as it is possible, of the entire domain of nature. This, in every age, has been the desire of the Church; upon the enlargement of the boundaries of the sciences has she been wont to bestow all possible labor and energy. By a letter, therefore, dated the seventh day of March, in the year of Our Lord 1889, directed to you, venerable brethren, we established at Washington, your capital city, esteemed by a majority of you a very proper seat for the higher studies, a University for the instruction of young men desirous of pursuing advanced courses. In announcing this matter to our venerable brethren, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, in Consistory, we expressed the wish that it should be regarded as the fixed law of the University to unite erudition and learning with soundness of faith and to imbue its students not less with religion than with scientific culture. To the Bishops of the United States we entrusted the task of establishing a suitable Course of Studies and of supervising the discipline of the students; and we conferred the office and authority of Chancellor, as it is called, upon the Archbishop of Baltimore. And, by Divine favor, a quite happy beginning was made. For, without any delay, whilst you were celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the establishment of your ecclesiastical Hierarchy, under the brightest auspices, in the presence of our Delegate, the divinity classes were

opened. From that time onward, we know that theological science has been imparted by the diligence of eminent men, the renown of whose talents and learning receives a fitting crown in their recognized loyalty and devotion to the Apostolic See. Nor is it long since we were apprised that, thanks to the liberality of a pious priest, a new building had been constructed, in which young men, as well cleric as lay, are to receive instruction in the natural sciences and in literature. From our knowledge of the American character, we are fully confident that the example set by this noble man will incite others of your citizens to imitate him; they will not fail to realize that liberality exercised towards such an object will be repaid by the very greatest advantages to the public.

No one can be ignorant how powerfully similar institutions of learning, whether originally founded by the Roman Church herself from time to time, or approved and promoted by her legislation, have contributed to the spread of knowledge and civilization in every part of Europe. Even in our own day, though other instances might be given, it is enough to mention the University of Louvain, to which the entire Belgian nation ascribes its almost daily increase in prosperity and glory. Equally abundant will be the benefits proceeding from the Washington University, if the professors and students (as we doubt not they will) be mindful of our injunctions, and shunning party spirit and strife, conciliate the good opinion of the people and the clergy.

We wish now, Venerable Brethren, to commend to your affection and to the generosity of your people the College which our predecessor, Pius IX., founded in this city for the ecclesiastical training of young men from North America, and which we took care to place upon a firm basis by a letter dated the twenty-fifth day of October, in the year of our Lord 1884. We can make this appeal the more confidently, because the results obtained from this institution have by no means belied the expectations commonly entertained regarding it. You yourselves can testify that, during its brief existence, it has sent forth a very large number of exemplary priests, some of whom have been promoted for their virtue and learning to the highest degrees of ecclesiastical dignity. We are, therefore, thoroughly persuaded that you will continue to be solicitous to send hither select young men who are in training to become the hope of the Church. For they will carry back to their homes and utilize for the general good the wealth of intellectual attainments and moral excellence which they shall have acquired in the city of Rome.

The love which we cherish towards the Catholics of your nation moved us, likewise, to turn our attention at the very beginning of our Pontificate, to the convocation of a third Plenary Council of

Baltimore. Subsequently, when the archbishops, at our invitation, had come to Rome, we diligently inquired from them what they deemed most conducive to the common good. We finally, and after mature deliberation, ratified by Apostolic authority the decrees of the prelates assembled at Baltimore. In truth the event has proven, and still proves, that the decrees of Baltimore were salutary and timely in the extreme. Experience has demonstrated their power for the maintenance of discipline; for stimulating the intelligence and zeal of the clergy; for defending and developing the Catholic education of youth. Wherefore, venerable brethren, if we make acknowledgment of your activity in these matters, if we laud your firmness tempered with prudence, we but pay tribute due to your merit; for we are fully sensible that so great a harvest of blessings could by no means have so swiftly ripened to maturity, had you not exerted yourselves, each to the utmost of his ability, sedulously and faithfully to carry into effect the statutes you had wisely framed at Baltimore.

But when the Council of Baltimore had concluded its labors, the duty still remained of putting, so to speak, a proper and becoming crown upon the work. This, we perceived, could scarcely be done in a more fitting manner than through the due establishment by the Apostolic See of an American Legation. Accordingly, as you are well aware, we have done this. By this action, as we have elsewhere intimated, we have wished, first of all, to certify that in our judgment and affection, America occupies the same place and rights as other States, be they ever so mighty and imperial. In addition to this we had in mind to draw more closely the bonds of duty and friendship which connect you and so many thousands of Catholics with the Apostolic See. In fact, the mass of the Catholics understood how salutary our action was destined to be; they saw, moreover, that it accorded with the usage and policy of the Apostolic See. For it has been, from earliest antiquity, the custom of the Roman Pontiffs in the exercise of the divinely-bestowed gift of the primacy in the administration of the Church of Christ to send forth legates to Christian nations and peoples. And they did this, not by an adventitious but an inherent right. For "the Roman Pontiff, upon whom Christ has conferred ordinary and immediate jurisdiction, as well over all and singular the churches, as over all and singular pastors and faithful,[1] since he cannot personally visit the different regions and thus exercise the pastoral office over the flock intrusted to him, finds it necessary, from time to time, in the discharge of the ministry imposed on him, to dispatch legates into different parts of the world, accord-

[1] Con. Vat. Sess., iv., c. 3.

ing as the need arises; who, supplying his place, may correct errors, make the rough ways plain, and administer to the people confided to their care increased means of salvation."[1]

But how unjust and baseless would be the suspicion, should it anywhere exist, that the powers conferred on the legate are an obstacle to the authority of the bishops! Sacred to us (more than to any other) are the rights of those "*whom the Holy Ghost has placed as bishops to rule the Church of God.*" That these rights should remain intact in every nation in every part of the globe, we both desire and ought to desire, the more so since the dignity of the individual bishop is by nature so interwoven with the dignity of the Roman pontiff that any measure which benefits the one necessarily protects the other. "My honor is the honor of the Universal Church. My honor is the unimpaired vigor of my brethren. Then am I truly honored, when to each one due honor is not denied."[2] Therefore, since it is the office and function of an apostolic legate, with whatsoever powers he may be vested, to execute the mandates and interpret the will of the pontiff who sends him, thus, so far from his being of any detriment to the ordinary power of the bishops, he will rather bring an accession of stability and strength. His authority will possess no slight weight for preserving in the multitude a submissive spirit; in the clergy discipline and due reverence for the bishops and in the bishops mutual charity and an intimate union of souls. And since this union, so salutary and desirable, consists mainly in harmony of thought and action, he will, no doubt, bring it to pass that each one of you shall persevere in the diligent administration of his diocesan affairs; that one shall not impede another in matters of government; that one shall not pry into the counsels and conduct of another; finally, that with disagreements eradicated and mutual esteem maintained, you may all work together with combined energies to promote the glory of the American Church and the general welfare. It is difficult to estimate the good results which will flow from this concord of the bishops. Our own people will receive edification; and the force of example will have its effect on those without—who will be persuaded by this argument alone that the divine apostolate has passed by inheritance to the ranks of the Catholic episcopate.

Another consideration claims our earnest attention. All intelligent men are agreed, and we ourselves have with pleasure intimated it above, that America seems destined for greater things. Now, it is our wish that the Catholic Church should not only share in, but help to bring about, this prospective greatness. We

[1] Cap. Un. Extrav. Comm. De Consuet, l. 1.

[2] S. Gregorius Epis. ad Eulog. Alex. lib. viii., ep. 30.

deem it right and proper that she should, by availing herself of the opportunities daily presented to her, keep equal step with the Republic in the march of improvement, at the same time striving to the utmost, by her virtue and her institutions, to aid in the rapid growth of the States. Now, she will attain both these objects the more easily and abundantly, in proportion to the degree in which the future shall find her constitution perfected. But what is the meaning of the legation of which we are speaking, or what is its ultimate aim except to bring it about that the constitution of the Church shall be strengthened, her discipline better fortified? Wherefore, we ardently desire that this truth should sink day by day more deeply into the minds of Catholics—namely, that they can in no better way safeguard their own individual interests and the common good than by yielding a hearty submission and obedience to the Church. Your faithful people, however, are scarcely in need of exhortation on this point; for they are accustomed to adhere to the institutions of Catholicity with willing souls and a constancy worthy of all praise.

To one matter of the first importance and fraught with the greatest blessings it is a pleasure at this place to refer, on account of the holy firmness in principle and practice respecting it which, as a rule, rightly prevails amongst you; we mean the Christian dogma of the unity and indissolubility of marriage; which supplies the firmest bond of safety, not merely to the family, but to society at large. Not a few of your citizens, even of those who dissent from us in other doctrines, terrified by the licentiousness of divorce, admire and approve in this regard the Catholic teaching and the Catholic customs. They are led to this judgment not less by love of country than by the wisdom of the doctrine. For difficult it is to imagine a more deadly pest to the community than the wish to declare dissoluble a bond which the law of God has made perpetual and inseverable. Divorce "is the fruitful cause of mutable marriage contracts; it diminishes mutual affection; it supplies a pernicious stimulus to unfaithfulness; it is injurious to the care and education of children; it gives occasion to the breaking up of domestic society; it scatters the seeds of discord among families; it lessens and degrades the dignity of women, who incur the danger of being abandoned when they shall have subserved the lust of their husbands. And since nothing tends so effectually as the corruption of morals to ruin families and undermine the strength of kingdoms, it may easily be perceived that divorce is especially hostile to the prosperity of families and States." [1]

[1] Encyc. *Arcanum.*

As regards civil affairs, experience has shown how important it is that the citizens should be upright and virtuous. In a free State, unless justice be generally cultivated, unless the people be repeatedly and diligently urged to observe the precepts and laws of the Gospel, liberty itself may be pernicious. Let those of the clergy, therefore, who are occupied with the instruction of the multitude, treat plainly this topic of the duties of citizens, so that all may understand and feel the necessity, in political life, of conscientiousness, self-restraint and integrity; for that cannot be lawful in public which is unlawful in private affairs. On this whole subject there are to be found, as you know, in the encyclical letters written by us from time to time in the course of our pontificate, many things which Catholics should attend to and observe. In these writings and expositions we have treated of human liberty, of the chief Christian duties, of civil government, and of the Christian constitution of States, drawing our principles as well from the teaching of the Gospels as from reason. They, then, who wish to be good citizens and discharge their duties faithfully may readily learn from our letters the ideal of an upright life. In like manner, let the priests be persistent in keeping before the minds of the people the enactments of the Third Council of Baltimore, particularly those which inculcate the virtue of temperance, the frequent use of the sacraments and the observance of the just laws and institutions of the Republic.

Now, with regard to entering societies, extreme care should be taken not to be ensnared by error. And we wish to be understood as referring in a special manner to the working classes, who assuredly have the right to unite in associations for the promotion of their interests; a right acknowledged by the Church and unopposed by nature. But it is very important to take heed with whom they are to associate; lest, whilst seeking aid for the improvement of their condition, they may be imperiling far weightier interests. The most effectual precaution against this peril is to determine with themselves at no time or in any matter to be parties to the violation of justice. Any society, therefore, which is ruled by and servilely obeys persons who are not steadfast for the right and friendly to religion is capable of being extremely prejudicial to the interests, as well of individuals as of the community; beneficial it cannot be. Let this conclusion, therefore, remain firm—to shun, not only those associations which have been openly condemned by the judgment of the Church, but those also which, in the opinion of intelligent men, and especially of the bishops, are regarded as suspicious and dangerous.

Nay rather, unless forced by necessity to do otherwise, Catholics ought to prefer to associate with Catholics, a course which

will be very conducive to the safeguarding of their faith. As presidents of societies thus formed among themselves, it would be well to appoint either priests or upright laymen of weight and character; guided by whose counsels, they should endeavor peacefully to adopt and carry into effect such measures as may seem most advantageous to their interests, keeping in view the rules laid down by us in our Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum.* Let them, however, never allow this to escape their memory; that whilst it is proper and desirable to assert and secure the rights of the many, yet this is not to be done by a violation of duty; and that these are very important duties; not to touch what belongs to another; to allow every one to be free in the management of his own affairs; not to hinder any one to dispose of his services when he please and where he please. The scenes of violence and riot which you witnessed last year in your own country sufficiently admonish you that America, too, is threatened with the audacity and ferocity of the enemies of public order. The state of the times, therefore, bids Catholics to labor for the tranquility of the commonwealth, and for this purpose to obey the laws, abhor violence, and seek no more than equity or justice permits.

Towards these objects much may be contributed by those who have devoted themselves to writing, and in particular by those who are engaged on the daily press. We are aware that already there labor in this field many men of skill and experience, whose diligence demands words of praise rather than of encouragement. Nevertheless, since the thirst for reading and knowledge is so vehement and widespread amongst you, and since, according to circumstances, it can be productive either of good or evil, every effort should be made to increase the number of intelligent and well-disposed writers who take religion for their guide and virtue for their constant companion. And this seems all the more necessary in America, on account of the familiar intercourse and intimacy between Catholics and those who are estranged from the Catholic name, a condition of things which certainly exacts from our people great circumspection and more than ordinary firmness. It is necessary to instruct, admonish, strengthen and urge them on to the pursuit of virtue and to the faithful observance, amid so many occasions of stumbling, of their duties towards the Church. It is, of course, the proper function of the clergy to devote their care and energies to this great work: but the age and the country require that journalists should be equally zealous in this same cause, and labor in it to the full extent of their powers. Let them, however, seriously reflect that their writings, if not positively prejudicial to religion, will surely be of slight service to it unless in concord of minds they all seek the same end. They who de-

sire to be of real service to the Church, and with their pens heartily to defend the Catholic cause, should carry on the conflict with perfect unanimity and, as it were, with serried ranks, for they rather inflict than repel war, if they waste their strength by discord. In like manner their work, instead of being profitable and fruitful, becomes injurious and disastrous whenever they presume to call before their tribunal the decisions and acts of bishops, and, casting off due reverence, cavil and find fault; not perceiving how great a disturbance of order, how many evils are thereby produced. Let them, then be mindful of their duty, and not overstep the proper limits of moderation. The bishops, placed in the lofty position of authority, are to be obeyed, and suitable honor befitting the magnitude and sanctity of their office should be paid them. Now, this reverence, "which it is lawful to no one to neglect," should of necessity be eminently conspicuous and exemplary in Catholic journalists. For journals, naturally circulating far and wide, come daily into the hands of everybody, and exert no small influence upon the opinions and morals of the multitude.[1]

We have ourself, on frequent occasions, laid down many rules respecting the duties of a good writer; many of which were unanimously inculcated as well by the Third Council of Baltimore as by the archbishops in their meeting at Chicago, in the year 1893. Let Catholic writers, therefore, bear impressed on their minds our teachings on this point as well as yours; and let them resolve that their entire method of writing shall be thereby guided, if they indeed desire, as they ought to desire, to discharge their duty well.

Our thoughts now turn to those who dissent from us in matters of Christian faith; and who shall deny that, with not a few of them, dissent is a matter rather of inheritance than of will? How solicitous we are of their salvation, with what ardor of soul we wish that they should be at length restored to the embrace of the Church, the common mother of all, our Apostolic Epistle, "*Praeclara*," has in very recent times declared. Nor are we destitute of all hope; for He is present and hath a care Whom all things obey and Who laid down His life that He might "gather in one the children of God who were dispersed." (John, xi., 52.)

Surely we ought not to desert them nor leave them to their fancies; but with mildness and charity draw them to us, using every means of persuasion to induce them to examine closely every part of the Catholic doctrine, and to free themselves from preconceived notions. In this matter, if the first place belongs to the

---

[1] Ep. *Cognita Nobis* ad Archiepp, et Epp. Provinciarum, Taurinen. Mediolanen. et Vercellen, xxv., Jan. an, MDCCCLXXXII.

bishops and clergy, the second belongs to the laity who have it in their power to aid the apostolic efforts of the clergy by the probity of their morals and the integrity of their lives. Great is the force of example; particularly with those who are earnestly seeking the truth, and who, from a certain inborn virtuous disposition, are striving to live an honorable and upright life, to which class very many of your fellow-citizens belong. If the spectacle of Christian virtues exerted the powerful influence over the heathens blinded, as they were, by inveterate superstition, which the records of history attest, shall we think it powerless to eradicate error in the case of those who have been initiated into the Christian religion?

Finally, we cannot pass over in silence those whose long-continued unhappy lot implores and demands succor from men of apostolic zeal; we refer to the Indians and the negroes who are to be found within the confines of America, the greatest portion of whom have not yet dispelled the darkness of superstition. How wide a field for cultivation! How great a multitude of human beings to be made partakers of the blessing derived through Jesus Christ!

Meanwhile, as a presage of heavenly graces and a testimony of our benevolence, we most lovingly in the Lord impart to you, venerable brethren, and to your clergy and people, our Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, near St. Peter's on the sixth day of January, the Epiphany of the Lord, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, the seventeenth of our Pontificate.

LEO PP. XIII.

LEO XIII. AND THE ENCYCLICAL "LONGINQUA."

THE very day on which we write these lines (March 3rd) Leo XIII. begins the eighteenth year of his marvellous pontificate amid the applause of the entire civilized world. The Encyclical "Longinqua Oceani Spatia" lies before us; it is an object at the same time of our gratitude, of our respect, and of our admiration. We would equally make it the object of our study, and endeavor to penetrate, as well as possible, the profundity of its grand lessons. But, before considering in detail the paternal words which the supreme Pastor of the Church has condescended to address to his children beyond the seas, thereby giving them a new proof of his "good will and solicitude,"[1] we feel inclined, we may say persuaded, by the advent of this happy day, to traverse in our turn "in spirit and thought the wide expanse of ocean," and to turn our eyes toward the Vatican. We would enlarge the horizon of meditation, and ascend to the veritable fountain of the sympathy and prayer which this glorious anniversary inspires. This we find, both in the incomparable grandeur of a dignity than which

> " . . . . no prouder height
> Lur'd on the climber."[2]

and in the influence, as well as in the singular activity of the Papacy of our day. Besides, these two considerations are the beacon-lights of our investigation. They cannot but inspire us with greater filial piety and joyful submission while treating truths coming from so high an authority.

Let us cast a rapid glance on the providential mission of the chair of Peter, which Leo XIII. occupies with such *éclat*, and in the same glance, include the grand results accomplished, during the last seventeen years, by the experienced hand which conducts the bark of the Fisherman.

I.—Rôle of the Papacy in Church and Society.

From the very beginning of Christianity, Catholic tradition has marked upon the brow of the Church the sublime and touching inscription, "Sancta *Mater* Ecclesia." This glorious title is, indeed, founded in the very nature of the divine institution, but it

[1] All quotations found in this article, unless otherwise specified, are taken from the Encyclical.

[2] Dante, *Purgatory*, xix., 110.

has also been established by the history of centuries, and ratified by the unanimous testimony of grateful nations. The same Catholic tradition has given the sweet and noble name of "*Father*, Pater Patrum, father of the fathers," to the one who represents in the highest degree on earth the primordial paternity of Him, "of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named."[1] The intimate connection between the two appellations is evident. They express the union of the two-fold work of God, between the Church of Christ and him who is her head, her representative in the full sense of the word, the depository, and even the source, of all the powers with which Christ has invested her. Yet more, this union is not a bringing together of two separable objects; but it is a perfect unity; the Church of Christ, such as she has in fact been established, cannot even be conceived without the successor of Peter, according to the telling expression of St. Francis of Sales, "the Church and the Pope *are one*," "tout un."

The Son of God created the Church after the image of the Virgin Mother, to communicate to humanity a new life of grace—to regenerate and readapt it to its proper dignity and its supernatural end. Thus, He has also given her an especial fecundity, making her the kingdom of divine light and life, viz., of divine truth, of divine authority, of divine grace. The Church is inundated with this divine light, luminous currents of it traverse and encompass her, and awake the joy and the enthusiasm of all those spirits who contemplate it without prejudice. This light comes from Christ, from God, from Him alone. The faith of the Church, the doctrine to be believed by every Christian, is the doctrine revealed by God; the laws of Christian morality, as the word implies it again, are the laws given by Christ, who alone is the "way, the truth, and the life." Finally, the God-man alone is our Redeemer, He is the only High Priest, the only Sanctifier of souls. And yet, all this divine light of the Church comes also from the Pope. It comes from him, as far as he is the instrument to transmit it. No, he is not the light illuminating the whole world, but he is "to give testimony of the light."[2] He is not the creator, not the producer of it, but he dispenses it, he brings it into action, and radiates it throughout the whole world. In founding His Church, Christ has first built its foundation, Peter, the Pope; He has filled this rock with divine light, with divine life; so to speak, He charged it with divine electricity, when He said to Peter: Be the spiritual father of all My children, communicate to them My divine life; beam forth My light, beam forth My authority, beam forth My grace; fill My house with it, confirm thy brethren with it,

[1] Eph., iii., 15. [2] Jo., i., 18.

feed My flock with it. Draw it out from My heart, not once, but in all times, in every century, at every hour, until the end of the world!

This is the sublime mission of the Papacy; this the divine light which surrounds it in all its splendor; this the very origin and expression of the Pope's *fatherly* dignity, power and influence.

Nineteen hundred years have elapsed since the time when God first placed the plenitude of the Church's power in the hands of Peter. "Pertransiit benefaciendo!"[1] "Blessings have everywhere marked his path." In these two words the Holy Spirit has, by the lips of the first Pope, described the earthly life of the Divine Master. Pertransiit benefaciendo! They trace also the history of that divine institution by which the Son of God perpetuates his visible presence on earth unto the end of time. To "renew all things in Christ";[2] to save souls, and procure for them their supreme good; to conduct men to the feet of Christ, where they may imbibe the sweet peace of conscience together with their true temporal well-being; to point out to prince and people the way of heaven and the civilizing influence of the religion of the cross; to be "*omnibus omnia*,"[3] "all things for all men"; to be the father of all—this is the noble mission to which the Papacy must at all times be devoted. If Leo XIII. could say in our day that "the history of the Papacy is the history of the benefits which mankind owes to the Roman Pontiffs,"[4] he has merely repeated what many prominent Protestant historians, such as Macaulay, in England; Ranke, in Germany; Guizot, in France, had already written and demonstrated. To the mind of the latter, the history of civilization is simply the history of the Church and the Papacy; if they had not existed, he says, "the entire world would have been given over to the control of brutal force." The interests of the Papacy have been at all times the interests of humanity, and the interests of humanity have ever been those of the Papacy.

This phenomenon gives us also the key to the history of our century. The Church alone, through her visible head, maintains and defends the divine dispensation in its integrity, and throughout its full extension, against the *threefold fundamental error of modern times*. These three errors tend to separate what, according to the providential plan of God, should remain distinct but still united. *Rationalism* endeavors to divorce reason and faith; *liberalism* affirms the hostility of Church and State; *socialism* brings capital and labor into opposition to each other. Now the teaching of the Church on these vital subjects has never varied. She establishes

[1] Acts, x., 38. [2] Eph., i., 10. [3] I. Cor., ix., 22.
[4] Letter addressed to Cardinals de Luca, Pitra, Hergenröther, 18th August, 1883.

the concordance of reason and more faith, the good feeling between Church and State, the harmony between capital and labor. Every effort on the part of a people to act in conformity to this divine plan has been blessed and recompensed; on the contrary, every revolt against the same providential ordinance has been punished. As the "soul of man is naturally Christian," so also is the soul of nations. In every branch of human activity; in every system, be it scientific, political or social; in public and in private life, we shall find the verification of the words: "Sine me nihil potestis facere."[1] "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God!"[2] Such was Peter's declaration, and such is to-day the declaration of the Pope. Uttered, then, for the first time by Peter, it will ever resound in all times and in all climes, since the Pope is the head of the Church for no other reason than to proclaim this truth to the world!

II.—The Pontificate of Leo XIII.

Our epoch is more apt than any other to appreciate the truth of this observation. The prevailing errors seem to have passed their maturity, if we may so express it, and have reached the climax of their evolution. We may perceive with the naked eye their veritable character and their fatal and impending sequences. Rationalism is about to end with what Mr. Brunetière, in the "Revue des Deux Mondes," has lately called "la banqueroute de la science," "the bankruptcy of science." The same "Revue" has proclaimed the final downfall of the "immortelles conquêtes," of 1789, of the so-called "rights of man," in opposition to divine right. Socialism forbodes a régime of tyranny, such as even the pagan world has never known. Hence the Church, faithful to her mission, as also to her character of universal teacher, becomes even more precise in expounding her doctrine, and redoubles her solicitude in her admonitions.

The late Cardinal Manning, when considering the number and the importance of the imposing lessons coming from the chair of Peter during the last eighty years, was wont to say: "The nineteenth century shall be known in history as the century of pontifical acts." And, surely, it would be extremely difficult to find a period in ecclesiastical history wherein the vigilance and apostolic prodigality of the popes have shown a greater activity. In this respect the reign of Leo XIII. will compare with those of Pius VI., Pius VII., Gregory XVI., and even with that of the great and immortal Pius IX.

We seldom meet with a man who already in his life is entered on the pages of history, and of whom we may write and speak as

[1] Jo., xv., 5. [2] Matt., xvi., 16.

if his acts were even now before the tribunal of posterity. To gain such a privilege, a man must unite, with integrity of character or ascendency of genius, public services sufficiently great to disarm all hostility. We can declare with legitimate pride, that even before it is ended, the pontificate of Leo XIII. has found its definitive place in the annals of contemporary ecclesiastics.[1]

The visitor to the castle of Ferney (Switzerland), which was once the home of Voltaire, is shown the picture of the impious philosopher, and beneath this is seen an oval cup in solid silver, upon which are inscribed the words: "Son coeur est ici, son esprit est partout!" "His heart is here, his spirit everywhere!" We may ask what now remains of Voltaire's heart and spirit? Obsolete sophisms and self-extinguishing blasphemies. Behold thus the destiny of the impious, verifying the words of the Holy Ghost: "Vidi impium superexaltatum et elevatum sicut cedros Libani, et transivi et ecce non erat, et quæsivi eum, et non est inventus locus eius!"[2]

The Vatican presents a quite different spectacle: A captive, a weak and aged man, yet courageous and filled with apostolic zeal. The most powerful of rulers, the head of that Church, the funeral of which the boasting Voltaire expected to attend.

Of *him* we can say in all truth: "Leo is in Rome, his spirit everywhere!" Never have the words of the Pope found a greater echo. They penetrate the palace of the sovereign, and stir the hearts of the people. And while the powers of the world tremble and quake and crumble, the Vatican presents a unique example of that moral force which is the only basis of every civilized society. This fact is so conspicuous that the unbeliever, Charles Benoist, remarked, a few months ago, in the "Revue des Deux Mondes:" "Nowhere has the Church subjects (!), yet in all climes are found her faithful, who are more submissive to the supreme teacher of faith and of morals than any subjects are to any prince."[3]

The highest authorities within the various camps unite in saying that the world has arrived at a solemn and critical period in its history. And at this moment, while the crisis approaches, the prisoner of the Vatican enjoys a wonderful increase of the influence and authority of his universal magistracy. The Papacy once more appears in the moral order as the sun of civilization. Every nation, every condition of man, all that thinks, all that intelligently

---

[1] See *Le Pape Léon XIII., Sa Vie, Son Action Religieuse, Politique et Sociale*, par Mgr. de T'Serclaes; 2 vols., 1894.

[2] Ps., xxxvi., 35, sq.

[3] "N'ayant nulle part des sujets, l'Eglise a en tout lieu des fidèles, plus soumis au suprême docteur de la foi et de la moralité que n'importe quels sujets à n'importe quel prince."

acts, is illumined by its rays. Charles Benoist, in commenting on the letter of Leo XIII. regarding the reunion of dissenting sects with the Church, says, in the review quoted above: "It is not the head of one church alone who has written this letter; it is the common father of that universal church which virtually embraces the whole of humanity within its fold." And he adds this significant declaration: "The affairs of Rome have more and more become the affairs of the world, and those of the world have, in like manner, become the affairs of Rome."[1]

From the lofty summits of his high position, the paternal regard of the Pope takes in the whole kingdom of Christ. The Vatican has the aspect of Sinai. Not, indeed, midst thunders and lightning, but in the august isolation of his captivity, Leo XIII. promulgates anew the Magna Charta of regenerated humanity, securing harmony between divine and human rights and powers. His voice, replete with authority, resembles the rumbling of mighty waters, dominates the tumult of modern activity, and the world starts with astonishment and emotion. In the feverish business life, and the alluring enticements of pleasure, it stops to hear the word of the Vicar of Jesus Christ: "Et stupebant super doctrina eius, erat enim docens eos quasi potestatem habens, et non sicut Scribae" . . . . "Quia in potestate est sermo eius."[2] Even the representatives of irreligion exclaim: "Nunquam sic locutus est homo, sicut hic homo!"[3]

And to-day the grandest intellects, the noblest hearts in all parts of the world, join Benoist in the expression of his love and admiration: "Leo XIII. reigns and governs—reigns so gloriously and governs so happily that we cannot but repeat the salutation which greets the ears of the newly elected Pope: "Ad multos annos!"[4]

III.—Leo XIII. and America.

In this concert of laudations, congratulations and prayers, America cannot be satisfied to occupy a subordinate position. On the contrary, she must be in the first ranks, and all the more since she has listened to the paternal voice of the Vicar of Jesus Christ in his Encyclical, the worthy crown of so many proofs of affec-

---

[1] "Ce n'est pas le maître exclusif d'une eglise qui a écrit cette lettre; c'est le Père commun de cette eglise universelle, dans laquelle virtuellement l'humanite entière est englobée." 'Les affaires de Rome sont de plus en plus devenues les affaires du monde, et les affaires du monde de plus en plus les affaires de Rome."

[2] Marc. I., 22; Luc. iv., 32.

[3] Jo. vii., 46

[4] "Léon XIII. règne et gouverne, il règne si glorieusement, et gouverne si heureusement, qu'on ne peut que répéter le cri par lequel les Papes sont salués à leur exaltation: Que ce soit encore pour de longues années! *Ad multos annos!*"—*Ibid.*

tionate solicitude with which the Holy Father has already been prodigal to us. We may say even more: American Catholics are not the only persons who listen with respect to the words of Leo, and they are not alone in offering their homage. The eagerness with which the leading papers of our country have published the whole encyclical, the kindly and admiring comments with which they generally accompanied it, the testimony which so many distinguished men have rendered publicly to the character and action of the Sovereign Pontiff, furnish a striking proof of this, were any other needed than the sense of justice which animates the American people. Mgr. Satolli had reason to say, on the occasion of the anniversary of Leo XIII.: "Nor will America, throughout its length and breadth, withhold its tribute of loyal and generous veneration, esteem and gratitude to the Pope for those acts of his Pontificate which have at various times been promulgated, and by which he has shown his confidence and hope in the grand future of this mighty nation. During the seventeen years of his rule, nothing has been more remarkable than the incessant growth of his benignant moral influence." Without distinction of belief or political parties, the American people fully appreciate the eminent qualities of heart and mind which distinguish Leo XIII., and they salute willingly the seat of Peter in the words of Saint Bernard: "Summae aequitatis sedes." They understand the benefits of Christian civilization; they are profoundly convinced that if the brotherhood of men is the basis of such civilization, God Himself is the apex, and that the manger of Bethlehem is its cradle. For this reason, the most eminent men of America look with respectful admiration upon this star, "*lumen in cælo*," which shines in the firmament of Rome to show us the way, and to invite peoples and kings, the great and the small, to bow before and adore their common Master, as once before the shepherds and princes coming from the east were led by a star. Specially do Americans worship that virtue so rare in our days—the virtue of gratitude. They honor their heroes, they honor their friends, they count Leo XIII. among their friends, and gladly address him these words of the poet:

"Tua me virtus tibi fecit amicum."

Thus the voice of Leo XIII. finds an echo in the heart of our people when he speaks as the head of that religion of which Columbus will always be one of the most beautiful ornaments. Our people never forget that "when America was but yet a newborn babe, uttering in its cradle its first feeble cries, the Church took it to her bosom and motherly embrace." They remember with the Pope the names of many illustrious missionaries written in their

history with letters of gold, perpetuated in the names of "so many of our towns and rivers and mountains and lakes, teaching and clearly witnessing how deeply our beginnings were marked with the footprints of the Catholic Church." They join the Catholics in celebrating with the Pope "the well-known friendships and the familiar intercourse," which existed between "the great Washington and the first bishop set by apostolic authority over the Church of America." They acknowledge Leo's "ardour of soul," his "mildness and charity," when he invites "those who dissent from us in matters of Christian faith" to unite in the Church, "the common mother of all"; his fatherly love, when he "implores and demands succour from men of apostolic zeal for the long and continued unhappy lot of the Indians and negroes."

And as to the personal sentiments of Leo XIII. to America, his name will ever be inseparable from what he calls "that most auspicious event," "auspicatissimum factum," the World's Fair of Chicago. We do not exaggerate in saying that not a sovereign of the world took a more active and cordial part in that memorable undertaking than the venerable captive-king of the Vatican. Leo XIII. has "shared our rejoicings and good wishes"; he entrusted the precious treasures of the Vatican libraries to the waves of the ocean for us; the oratory of the Vatican has witnessed the prayers offered by the Supreme Pontiff "for our welfare and our greatness," and "wishing to be in some manner present with us in our festivities, he cheerfully sent one who should represent his person." And we do not need to say that his noble heart, as well as his distinguished mind, presided over the choice of the representative. But let us hasten to add that this special participation of the Holy Father in our national success was but just and most natural. It was just, and could not have failed to be, by reason of the majesty and moral force of the power with which he is invested, for no monarch of the earth represents an empire so remarkable in extent and influence as the spiritual pastor of a kingdom which extends "from sea to sea, and from the river unto the end of the earth."[1] Again, it was but natural, owing to the shining personality of Leo XIII., in whom, underlying the Pontiff, is the eminent literateur and the refined connoisseur and lover of the creations of human art. It was natural, moreover, from the eager interest which he never fails to give to all that honors and raises humanity; and last, but not least, from "the high esteem and the great love" which he proclaims before the whole world for "a nation in which he plainly discerns latent forces for the advancement alike of civilization and Christianity."

[1] Ps. 71, 8.

The innermost reason for this predilection for America has been expressed by Leo XIII. in four words of his Encyclical, words which we think defy translation into any modern language. If the imagination could conceive of our country as a vast dwelling, and, written upon that dwelling, an inscription giving the distinctive character of its inhabitants, where is the philologist who could render in more expressive and significant a phrase, the meaning of these words:

Americanum
validum iuventâ genus!

It is after the manner of the sculptor, in the style of the lapidary, it is, as it were, cut in the marble by a master hand; it is incisive, it is striking, it is energetic, each word tells; the design is complete in its essential outline: it is a strong and robust nation, full of initiative and activity, shrinking from no labor, from no enterprise, gifted with noble and generous feelings, "progressing and developing by giant strides," having made "in the course of one century a marvellous increase in wealth and power." It possesses these qualities in all the vigor of youth. It possesses the advantages which that "flos virentis aevi" gives, the "invenilis calor et fervor," of which the poet speaks, but it is also surrounded with the dangers of this "aetas apta capi" and "pravi docilis."

Speaking afterwards of the establishment of the republic, the Holy Father characterizes the conquest of the war for independence by the two classic words of Tacitus: "*libertatem et principatum.*" He rejoices in it, and recalls with satisfaction that the result was obtained "with Catholic aid." The author of the life of Agricola congratulated Nerva and Trajan for having finally united, thanks to their personal qualities, the two things "which formerly seemed incompatible: res olim dissociabiles; principatum et libertatem." Now, by what means can there be preserved to a nation so vigorous and prosperous these two things upon which Leo XIII. so warmly congratulates America? What preventives can be employed against the dangers of youth? Washington was more of a statesman than Nerva and Trajan; he was a more experienced observer in this matter than Tacitus. He was not only an excellent general and skillful administrator; he was, first of all, a religious man, a Christian. In order to unite "liberty and independent government," he proclaimed loudly the necessity of morality, that the State should have a solid basis, to avoid the excess of individual liberty as well as abuse of power, and to ensure the true happiness of the people. Leo XIII. does not hesitate to associate himself with the declaration made by "the illustrious citizen, with a keenness of insight worthy of his genius

and statesmanship." He gives this thought its necessary completion by saying: no morality without religion! And why? Because "religion by its very nature guards and defends all the principles on which duties are founded." It alone attaches governments and peoples to the only Legislator for all men; it alone suggests motives of action which are independent of human caprice; it alone establishes an effectual sanction for the exercise of liberty. If this is so, does a Pope need to recall at length to the American people that the Catholic Church teaches, preserves, and develops this religious sentiment? That, consequently, it has an inherent right to full and entire liberty in all civil society, and that it is in the interest of society to accord it such liberty? The Holy Father contents himself with few words to indicate this very evident conclusion, which could only be contested by the hatred of a blind Puritanism.

May the "latent forces" which the perspicacious eye of Leo XIII. sees in our people, develop evermore "for the advancement alike of civilization and Christianity." May the foundation of this grandiose social edifice, laid by such men as Washington, become firmer day by day "by the most powerful influence of religion." The time of youth passes for nations as well as for individuals, but nations may preserve their strength and vigor by avoiding that consumption of peoples which is called indifferentism in the matter of religion; which is a necessary consequence, in the moral order as in the physical order, of a life given exclusively to earthly pleasures and satisfactions. The national spirit must before all be a Christian spirit. If "God giveth joy to the youth"[1] of a people, he can also "renew it like the eagle's."[2] Let us hope that at the close of another century a Leo will again send his greeting to the mighty eagle of America, and that he will address it to the Catholic Church strengthened and enlarged; to a whole nation as earnest in its attachment for religion as in its love of independence and liberty; to a matured America, whose character and glory may be expressed in these words:

Americanum
validum religione genus
amico foedere socians
Libertatem et Principatum!

IV.—Leo XIII. and Catholic America.

Let us now behold the Father in the midst of his Catholic family, among those of his children who join to the sentiments of respect and admiration those of filial piety and complete submission. We will not stop to consider the eulogies and expressions

[1] Ps. 42, 4. [2] Ps. 102, 5.

of good will made to both high and low, to both pastor and people, but rather hasten to hear the commands, the teachings, and admonitions of the supreme ruler and teacher.

Apostolic Delegation.

Unity is an essential quality of the Church; it is at the same time the strength of the hierarchy, the clergy, and the people; it must be the characteristic mark of every Catholic institution; it will insure the success of every work of faith or of charity. Hence the Holy Father insists on unity in several parts of the encyclical. A primary condition of united activity is an intimate connection with the head of the Church, the See of Peter. Leo XIII. mentions with pleasure that Catholic America has always been distinguished for this; but he wishes "to draw more closely the bonds of duty and attachment which connect so many thousands of Catholics to the apostolic see." In order to execute this noble design, and at the same time to certify "that in his judgment and affection America occupies the same place and rights as other states," Leo XIII. has established the apostolic delegation, "the true meaning and the ultimate aim" of which is "to strengthen the constitution of the Church and to fortify her discipline." The Holy Father relates a well-known fact in stating that "the mass of the Catholics understand how salutary this action was destined to be." We shall be allowed to quote here the very words in which this sentiment was expressed at a solemn gathering of American Catholics:

"The apostolic delegation is the creation of an especial solicitude of the Holy Father for our country. The great Leo XIII. has sent us his delegate by right of the supreme jurisdiction which he holds over the whole Church, and by the inspiration of his all-embracing and paternal love, in which we have our own peculiar share. Hence we heartily salute the delegate in the words of St. Ignatius:[1] 'Whom the father sendeth we receive, even as the father himself.'"

This is the expression of an enlightened faith, of Catholic conviction; hence it is shared by all the Catholics of our land.

No one outside the Church who judges impartially will misunderstand our position. We Catholics, as American citizens, desire home rule, and publicly proclaim that none but our own people, and those elected to represent them, shall direct our political and civil affairs. We likewise demand home rule for the Church, by right of our Catholic and American freedom. In our conviction, God has placed the Pope at the head of the Church, and he

[1] "Quemcunque enim Paterfamilias mittit ad gubernandam familiam suam, hunc ita accipere debemus sicut ipsum qui mittit."—*S. Ign. M. ad Eph.*

alone has the right to govern the whole Church. Those sent by him, whether delegate or bishop, of whatever nation they may be, coming in his name and bearing his authority, are therefore at home in every quarter of the globe, as the father is everywhere at home among his children. Let us then as Catholics give renewed expression of this conviction, by laying at the feet of Monsig. Satolli, the illustrious representative of the Holy See, the vow of our respect and obedience. A resolution unanimously adopted by the same congress reads: "We hail with joy the establishment of the apostolic delegation in these United States, since it is a proof of the paternal love and solicitude of the Holy Father for our country, and particularly for the Catholics of America."[1]

Faith and Reason.

Speaking in the capacity of supreme teacher of the Church, the Holy Father indicates precisely the stand which we Catholics of America must take in regard to the triple error mentioned above.

Leo XIII. "commends to the affection and generosity" of the American Catholics the American college at Rome and gives a most emphatic answer to *rationalism* by directing special attention to the Catholic University of America. This University is the creation of Leo XIII. Its whole purpose, its only ambition, is to protect and enlighten our faith by the advancement of science and learning in every direction. Even more, the encyclical inscribes the proud words on our banner: "*Anteire, non subsequi!*" "Be leaders, not followers, in the existing keen competition of knowledge; cultivate refinement of learning; investigate so far as it is possible the entire domain of nature." Do we accept? Most willingly and joyfully. By obedience? Yes; by a rational obedience, by an obedience enlightened by the strongest conviction, which the very motto of the university inspires: *Deus lux mea!* Our God is the God of sciences, "Deus scientiarum Dominus." This infallible word is our "stella rectrix," our guiding star; it makes our faith reasonable, unshakable; it encourages and directs the investigation of the scientist, and places a restraint on only one liberty, the sad liberty of error.

Next fall will witness the opening of the philosophical department of the university. McMahon Hall will perpetuate the name of its noble and pious donor, whose generosity has also been commended by the Holy Father in the pages of the encyclical. Besides the name of Mgr. McMahon, the words, "Science, Philosophy, Letters," appear conspicuously engraved in the stone of the beautiful structure. The roof will be crowned by a statue of

[1] See Report of the Congress of the Delegates of the German-American Centralverein, assembled in New York, September, 1894.

"Christ, the Light of the World." Thus we proclaim openly our conviction that in "following Him we shall not walk in the darkness of error."[1]

From the apostle of this same Christ we learn what became of the wisdom of those who "liked not to have God in their knowledge"; "they became vain in their thoughts" and "changed the truth of God into a lie."[2] We witness the same fact in our day. The false science of paganism, the science without God, has been resuscitated. In the name of "emancipated science" and "independent morals" gigantic efforts have been made to lay bare the secrets of God's creation without and even against revelation; to "secure to mankind the maximum of happiness and morality."[3] And now the most authorized representatives of this new "science" and "morality" feel themselves obliged to confess: "In vanum laboravimus!" Do we, therefore, deny the real progress of modern science? In no way; we proclaim it highly; we are proud of it and associate faith with it, because it also belongs to us; for, as Thiers says: "Catholicity has never impeded one thought, unless it be of such who were not made to think."[4] Reason itself advises us to avoid the example of those who "are led astray by incomprehensible errors because they refuse to believe incomprehensible mysteries."[5] Following the advice of the Holy Father, we will do our utmost to emulate the grand example of the alma mater of Louvain, which, in our day, as it has done in the past, gives to both church and science many illustrious champions, and which, in great measure, procured for Belgium the honorable position she so nobly occupies among Christian nations.

Church and State.

The relationship between *Church and State* is treated in our encyclical in a very significant way. The passage referring to it is even, in our judgment, the most striking feature of the papal document. Leo XIII. surely does not propose any new doctrine or decision; but he shows in an unmistakable way his intention to place us on our guard against what is called by the Vatican Council the "attenuation" of Catholic doctrine, the inevitable consequence of which is a dangerous condescension towards error, a weakening of the true spirit of faith and of truly Catholic

[1] "Qui sequitur me, non ambulat in tenebris."—John viii., 12.

[2] Rom. i.

[3] "Assurer aux hommes le maximum de bonheur et de moralité." So Renan, Condorcet, and lately Berthelot.

[4] "Le catholicisme n'a jamais empêché de penser que ceux qui n'étaient pas faits pour penser."

[5] "Pour ne pas vouloir croire d'incompréhensibles mystères, les incrédules suivent d'incompréhensibles erreurs."

courage in its profession. "It often unfortunately happens that by the gradual diminution of the revealed doctrine Catholic sentiment is attenuated in the children of the Church."[1] The Holy Father accurately distinguishes between the *hypothesis* and the *thesis*, between the *fact* and the *principle*, between a peculiar situation existing in our country and a normal state of things, between the condition of salutary Catholic activity and its true cause.

As to the *fact*, Leo XIII. fully recognizes that the separation of Church and State, as established by our constitution, and practically observed in our country, is not only a social *necessity* but also a social *benefit*. "Thanks to the equity of the laws in America, the Church is free to live and to act without hindrance, unopposed by the constitution and the government, fettered by no hostile legislation, protected against violence by the common laws and the impartiality of the tribunals." This is the result of religious liberty, which our republic acknowledges in all its logical consequences. She does not only permit the liberty of conscience in the individual, but guarantees also the social existence of the church, her right of self-government and self-propagation. This separation of Church and State has nothing in common with a certain régime, which, on the other side of the Atlantic, screens and dissimulates very often under the same banner the oppression of the church by the state. But the separation of Church and State, even if loyally practiced, as it is in our country, is not the *normal condition*, nor is it applicable in all places. In the first place, the historical development and the religious situation of a country might have brought about a quite different state of things, equally legitimate, equally advantageous, and *even better*.

Moreover, the Catholic ideal—not only theoretical, but quite practical, and the one which has often been realized—is the *harmonious alliance* between Church and State, a union which does not destroy in any way the distinction between the two powers, nor their mutual independence in their own sphere of action. The Church and State are two distinct forms of human society; two circles, placed one above the other, without, however, being blended. Society, as such, has been elevated to the supernatural order, as well as man himself. Christ is the king of nations, as well as of the individual—rex populorum, rex regum et dominus dominantium. His Church, by the heritance of His divine authority over souls, possesses the same royal dignity in regard to Christian society and Christian government which she enjoys in the homage paid by each of her faithful. This immutable truth of faith does

[1] "Infeliciter contigit, ut plures etiam e catholicae Ecclesiae filiis a via verae pietatis aberrarent, in iisque, *diminutis paullatim veritatibus, sensus catholicus attenuaretur*." —*Const. de Fide*, cap. iv.

not destroy the complete independence nor the perfect autonomy of the civil power exercised in its proper sphere, but it denies that the civil power is absolutely and in all matters independent of the Church. To admit this independence of the State as *a principle* would be to fall into the error of liberalism, which is, in fact, a *social rationalism*, or a denial of the social kingdom of Christ. Consequently, it is an error that must be uprooted, "error tollendus," to maintain "that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable state of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient, *universe licere* vel *expedire*, for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced."

Finally, to attribute the wonderful growth of the Church in the United States only, or principally, to the régime under which Catholics live in this country, would be to confound the intrinsic *cause* of activity within the Church with the *exterior condition* of her free development. The Church exists by force of her own vitality, the result of her indestructible spirit, her divine life: in a word, it is the Holy Ghost who penetrates her whole being, her activity as well as her life. No doubt a carefully guarded liberty of worship facilitates her action by removing the obstacles which hostile legislation might oppose to her progress; but "she would bring forth more abundant fruits, if, in addition to liberty she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority." "Quod enim incolumis apud vos res est catholica, quod prosperis etiam auctibus crescit, id *omnino* fecunditati tribuendum, qua divinitus pollet Ecclesia, quaeque si nullus adversetur, si nulla res impedimento sit, se sponte effert atque effundit; longe tamen uberiores editura fructus si, praeter libertatem, gratia legum fruatur patocinioque publicae potestatis."

But is not this doctrine offensive to the ears of those who are prejudiced against us? or even to the spirit of patriotism? To answer the former seeming objection, it will be sufficient to remember that we undertake the task of Tantalus when we attempt to remove all prejudices against the truth, or to dispose of every evil pretext of our enemies, for bad faith never lays down its arms. In regard to patriotism, Melchior de Vogué, member of the French Academy, has very well said: "We speak of patriotism to-day more than ever before, and while we deafen our ears with its din the virtue is itself mutilated."[1] An excellent French daily (*La Croix*) lately made this statement: "The French people would become the greatest nation on earth if they would only cease to believe themselves already so; or if they would only take the trouble to look about occasionally to see what other nations are doing." This is not true beyond the seas alone. Since when has

[1] "L'on n'a jamais tant qu'aujour d'hui parlé de la patrie, et, pendant que l'on s'étourdit du mot, la chose s'altère."

patriotism become identical with Chauvinism? Since when does loyalty to one's country rob the citizen of the liberty of thought, oblige him to disavow the knowledge of any perfection, either ideal or existing, he may find elsewhere, so as to be able to vaunt his own as the ideal government? But we would say even more. The very love of country urges us to profess and practice our faith in its integrity, for the Catholic religion is the chief safeguard of patriotism, since it makes it our duty to be "upright and virtuous citizens;" to observe in "political life conscientiousness, self-restraint, and integrity." Again, by practicing our faith, we manifest our attachment to the constitution. This guarantees religious liberty, which is the most precious of all. Now, do we make use of this liberty of conscience if we allow ourselves to be frightened into a semi-profession of our faith, either by curtailing, or by hiding it under a bushel? Shall we, under a vain pretext of toleration or pacification, allow the non-Christian, of whatever school, to occupy the floor alone? Surely, if we have one spark of Christian pride remaining, if we estimate the true value of the precious treasure of our faith, we shall never suffer such humiliation and ostracism. "Christianity," said a pious religious, a martyr of the commune, Father Olivaint, S.J., "rests upon the testimony, that is to say, on the courage, of those who profess it. Under a government of universal tolerance, a Catholic may and must courageously defend the liberty of truth, and since all claim the right of expressing their opinions, why should not we also have the courage of our convictions? Ours are not mere changeable and uncertain opinions, but immutable principles which never vary. We have the truth, and consequently have not an apparent but a real right to bring it before the searchlight." As Catholics, then, and as Americans, we profess our faith without diminution or dissemblance. If we shrink from the task, our non-Catholic fellow citizens will be the first to shrug their shoulders, as, on the contary, they will be the first to admire our Christian courage, and our true American spirit of independence.

Social Question.

The present state of evolution which *socialism* is undergoing, adds a new importance to the passages of the encyclical which refer to economic and social problems of our country. We here find the line of thought which inspired and dictated the encyclical "Rerum novarum," expressed in a manner both concrete and precise. It will suffice to read the doctrines and advice here given in order to be convinced that in the eyes of Leo XIII. it is impossible to conciliate two such opposite principles as Christianity and socialism, and that "Christian socialism" must be considered as a veritable monstrosity. The law which presides over the rela-

tion between capital and labor is not a law of antagonism, but one of reciprocity and harmony; it is the divine law of justice and charity. All theories and practices which deviate from this line of action will only serve to perpetuate, embitter and develop the present social entanglement. The obvious solution of the social problem lies in the *Christian concordat* between capital and labor as proposed by Leo XIII. Even in the purely political and economic point of view, this is the only one which is practicable, pacifying and lasting, otherwise society will sway helplessly between inconsiderate (blind) reaction and violent revolution, between despotism, which preserves nothing, and socialism, which destroys all.

Socialism must, and in fact does, bear ill will against *religion*, which presents to man his final and eternal destiny beyond the tomb, and teaches him to accept the inequalities and trials of this life. Bebel and Liebknecht (Germany), Jaurès and Guesde (France), Anseele and Vandervelde (Belgium), have carried the social atheism of liberalism to its logical conclusion by proclaiming the maxim: Ni Dieu, ni maître! No God, no master! The solution of the social question supposes, therefore, above all, the restoration of society in Christ, the observance of the "precepts and the laws of the gospel."

Socialism attempts to destroy the bonds of *family* union, because the acquisition, augmentation, and perpetuation of property is the natural coronation of domestic society. Hence it is necessary to inculcate "the Christian dogma of the *unity and indissolubility of marriage*," to oppose by all means "the licentiousness of *divorce*," which is "the most deadly pest to the community"; it "ruins families and undermines the strength of kingdoms."

Socialism favors everywhere the "*neutral schools*," the "schools without any religious creed." The leaders openly call them the "nurseries of socialism," "des pépinières du socialisme," (Anseele), the "seminaries of socialists" "des fabriques de socialistes," (Vandervelde). Logic, as well as events proves them to be in the right. Because "neutral schools," even when they do not positively combat religion, "hide, repell, and exile it; they destroy religious sentiment and prepare the youth for social iniquity," as Jules Simon has well said. The school question is, therefore, an eminently *social* question, and M. de Burlet, Minister of Public Instruction in Belgium, was right in saying, a few weeks ago, "I am profoundly convinced, that there is no social undertaking more important, more essential, than the restoration of religious sentiment by means of the school; . . . . this religious sentiment has become weakened in a great measure among the children of the official (neutral) schools." Here we have the reason why the Holy

Father in the encyclical thrice returns to the subject of Christian education of youth, warmly recommending the "Catholic parochial schools," the "Sunday schools for imparting Christian doctrine, and summer schools." Here again is the reason why he insists on the duty "to carry into effect, sedulously and faithfully the decrees of the third Plenary Council of Baltimore," mentioning especially the decrees "for defending and developing the Catholic education of youth."

Socialism deceives and misleads the workingman more easily, because, in connection with its subversive doctrines, it proposes some *useful reforms*, and objects to certain *real abuses*. In order to gain ascendency, it develops the *labor associations*, notably those whose members are bound to a blind obedience toward their leaders, particularly in case of strkes.

The Catholic clergy and people should therefore make it their duty to look after the condition of the laborer, and take an active interest in every movement to advance his welfare. The laborers have the *perfect right* "to seek aid for the improvement of their condition"; "it is proper and desirable to assert and secure the rights of the many." "But this is not to be done at any time or in any manner by violation of justice and duty."

To preserve the workingman from the tyranny of the socialists, it is necessary zealously to favor the formation of *Christian labor associations:* "The working classes have assuredly the right to unite in associations for the promotion of their interests. But these unions must never be of a kind in which the material improvement of the laborers may imperil far weightier, viz., the religious and moral, interests."

Without being properly religious associations they should always be *based upon religion;* they must "never be ruled by and servilely obey persons who are not steadfast for the right and friendly to religion"; otherwise "they will be extremely prejudicial to the interests as well of individuals as of the community. Beneficial they cannot be."

The Holy Father strongly asserts the *liberty* of the workingman: "Nobody is allowed to hinder any one to dispose of his services when he pleases and where he pleases." This rule of conduct has a deep significance. In Europe, where the question of syndicates is debated among Catholics, the conclusion has been drawn from our encyclical—and, it seems to us, not without good reason—that the Holy Father rejects the so-called obligatory syndicates ("syndicats obligatoires"). This same rule guards the laborer against the arbitrary and tyrannical imposition of strikes often initiated by socialistic leaders. In alluding to the strikes of last year the Pope points out their danger, and the evils of which they are often and even ordinarily the cause.

Among the things which "filled with hope and joy" the heart of Leo XIII., he enumerates also "the associations for mutual aid, for the relief of the indigent, for the promotion of temperate living." He likewise desires the Catholics in general, as he does the working men in particular, to join no society other than those which are frankly Catholic, in order to secure "the safeguards of their faith," "unless forced by necessity to do otherwise." By a still stronger motive are they obliged "to shun not only those associations which have been openly condemned by the judgment of the Church, but those also which, in the opinion of intelligent men, and especially of the bishops, are regarded as suspicious and dangerous."

The *priest* naturally occupies a specified place in the work of social restoration. He knows that the poor are the aristocracy of the Church; he is the social man by excellence, because he has always been, and still is, the man of all. According to the Holy Father, the priest must take the initiative, and become the propagator, and even the director, of associations of labor, wherever circumstances will permit. "As presidents of societies thus formed among Catholics, it would be well to appoint either *priests* or upright laymen of weight and character."

This new field of sacerdotal activity is plainly indicated in the words which the Holy Father last year addressed to a bishop whose ardent zeal for the advancement of the working classes has merited for him the glorious name of "l'évêque des ouvriers," "the bishop of the workingmen," Mgr. Doutreloux, of Liège (Belgium):

"Shall we allow the laborer to pass over to Socialism and to revolt? It is the priest, first of all, who must be exhorted to go before the people! He can no longer remain shut up in his church and presbytery. He must be animated with the apostolic spirit of a St. Francis Xavier, who went about here and there, everywhere, scattering the blessings of religion."[1]

Catholic Press.

Among the liberties which, in the words of the Holy Father, might become "pernicious," we must not fail to cite that of the press. Leo XIII. has in various documents insisted on the apostolate of the press either for good or evil; he has, on many occasions, been pleased to show an especial regard for its representatives, including non-Catholics, only refusing to deal with the adepts of abject materialism, or the bad faith of a Zola. The encyclical devotes a magnificent page to this subject, remarkable for the broadness and depth of views therein expressed; and it

[1] See the very remarkable pastoral letter of the same bishop on the social question: "Lettre Pastorale sur la Question Ouvrière," Liège, 1894, p. 31.

shows how well the pontiff discerns the pulsations of our epoch, and particularly of America. Here, too, Leo XIII., by his art of well-saying, has given expression, in two words, to a motto, the conscientious application of which can alone guarantee to the press a civilizing influence: "*Religione duce, probitate comite!*" This, says the Holy Father, must be above all the sacred and unalterable rule of conduct for the Catholic press, since the part it has to play has a greater importance in a country where the people are obliged to live in an environment of would-be neutrality, and to breathe an atmosphere impregnated with indifferentism. This masterly page contains words of great consolation and encouragement for those who have undertaken a work so meritorious, and yet so often thankless and unpromising. The Holy Father reminds us, at the same time, that the honor of defending the Church, and of seconding her efforts for good, does not imply the right of advising and much less of governing her. The journalist belongs not to the teaching, but to the hearing body of the Church. The episcopal authority is of divine origin, and must always be respected. Obedience to this authority will ever be one of the first duties of all who wish to properly serve religion. Besides, this sincere submission is the test and bond of that perfect unity of doctrine and of action without which the influence of the press, instead of being beneficial to the progress of catholicity, or the salvation of souls, tends rather to become dangerous and destructive. "Ut plane non tam repellere, quam inferre bellum, si qui vires discordia dissipant videantur."

This rule of conduct is based on the very constitution of the Church. The occasions of putting it in practice will certainly not be wanting. Let us call it to mind especially when duty demands a sacrifice. It is the best means the editor has of securing for his labor and propaganda an increased efficiency, which will revert to the good of religion and society.

"Simon, lovest thou Me more than these?" Thus spoke the Saviour to the first Pope; thus He spoke to his successors, and thus He speaks to Leo. And in the name of Leo, answer the Orient and the Occident, the faithful of the universe: Yes, Holy Father, thou hast proven thy love for Christ. The whole world witnesseth thy indefatigable zeal for the glory of God and the welfare of humanity. Thou art truly the Father of thy children. We Catholics of America have special reasons to praise thy fatherly love. The late encyclical is a new proof of thy affection. We express our thanks, our filial devotion and obedience. We believe what thou believest; we condemn what thou condemnest. We heed thy doctrine and counsels. *Nemo tam Pater!*

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY. JOS. SCHROEDER, D.D.

ITALY'S RECONCILIATION WITH THE HOLY SEE.

Le Pape Léon XIII., sa vie, son action religieuse, politique et sociale. Par Mgr. de T'SERCLAES, avec une introduction par Mgr. Baunard. Paris: Desclée, De Brouwer et Cie. Two volumes. Illustrated.

SEVENTEEN years ago when the telegraph girdled the world with tidings of the death of Pius IX., and of the hostile advance of British and Russian forces on Constantinople, there was sorrow in the hearts of many, dismay in all. The war-clouds so long on the horizon seemed settling over the Turkish capital, and Europe trembled on the brink of a great war. The critical state of affairs on the Bosphorus was most providential, for it left diplomacy no time to meddle in the great events taking place on the banks of the Tiber. Without let or hindrance from Italian or other governments the Conclave was held, and the gloom cast over the Catholic world by the death of Pius IX. was dispelled, when on February 20, 1878, the aged Cardinal Caterini proclaimed from the balcony of the façade of St. Peter's to an anxious crowd: "*Annuntio vobis gaudium magnum. Habemus Papam Eminentissimum et Reverendissimum Dominum Joachim Pecci qui sibi nomen imposuit Leonis XIII.* And so, as Mr. Charles Kent, in his epigram after St. Malachy's prophecy has beautifully expressed it:

> "Through the Cross on Cross of Pius,
> As through Mary's Dolours Seven,
> Lo! from Death what Life emerges,
> Joy from anguish, Light from Heaven."

How that *Lumen in caelo* has shone amid the darkness of the last seventeen years, is admirably told in the remarkable volumes of Mgr. de T'Serclaes, rector of the Belgian College in Rome. He has had exceptional advantages in writing them; he has had access to both the Pecci and Vatican archives; he is honored with the personal friendship of the Holy Father; he has seen much of what he graphically describes; and he has watched events from a position that has enabled him to grasp their importance and understand their drift. The volumes have been written with the Pope's approval, and almost under his supervision, and reach us with the warm approbation of the Cardinal Secretary of State, and an eulogistic preface from the skilled pen of the Rector of the Catholic University of Lille.

Nobody can rise up from the perusal of this work without

having improved his knowledge of the world's affairs, and without an increased admiration for Leo XIII. It passes in review all the acts of the first sixteen years of the present Pontificate. The Pope's encyclical and other letters, on Socialism, philosophy, religious affairs in France, Christian marriage, the propagation of the faith, the relation of the secular and regular clergy in England, civil government, religious affairs in Italy, the Third Order of St. Francis, historical studies, the rosary, Freemasonry, the Christian constitution of States, liberty, the duties of Christian peoples, slavery, the working classes; these, and many more, are analyzed in a masterly manner. This long yet incomplete list of the subjects on which Leo XIII. has written, enables us to apply to him what was said of a great author: "What subject has he not touched, and touching adorned?"

These striking documents would alone suffice to glorify any pontificate; but Leo has added to his pontificate other glories. He has founded professorships and academies to promote philosophy and literature; he has opened the Vatican archives in the interest of history; he has honored art by such restorations as that of the Lateran apse; he has aided science by the erection of the Vatican observatory. The canonizations and beatifications, among them those of our own English martyrs, momentous events as they are, are not peculiar in their kind to Leo's reign. Not so the religious pacification of Germany and other countries. They form the crowning glory of his pontificate. The late Czar, Alexander III., was a great peacemaker in the material order; Leo XIII. is a greater peacemaker, for he has restored peace of a higher order —religious peace—to millions. And a true *pax Romana* would reign all over the world, would men but listen to the Pope's words. Unfortunately, it is in Rome, in his own city, and in Italy, his own country, that perverse men least listen to his words. Let us see what we can gather on this important subject from Mgr. de T'Serclaes's volumes.[1] In making this selection, we shall be fulfilling the desire Leo XIII. expressed in an audience given on February 2, 1879, to a thousand representative Catholic journalists, that Catholic writers should never cease from insisting on the necessity of the Pope's civil sovereignty.[2]

At the very outset of his pontificate, the watchword of the powers of darkness was to describe the new Pope as one who would reverse the *non possumus* policy of Pius IX. They feigned not to know that, in matters of principle, Leo XIII. would be as rocklike as any of his long line of predecessors. They could have

[1] The references throughout this paper, unless otherwise stated, are to Mgr. de T'Serclaes's volumes.

[2] I., 254.

expected no weakness from Cardinal Pecci, if they had taken to heart his character as traced by one of the founders of the Italian kingdom, Ratazzi, than whom, Thiers once said, there was no shrewder observer in all Europe:

"This Pecci is a man of undoubted worth; strong of will, and of singular strictness in the exercise of his duties; yet withal, possessing the most pleasing manners possible. During his sojourn at Benevento, he showed at once his great abilities and his decided, unyielding character. Often have I spoken of him with King Leopold I., than whom no king had more discernment of character, who had studied and appreciated Pecci as Nuncio in Belgium. We spoke of his great prudence, integrity, and stately manners, which made our officials live in dread of his person. His devotion to the Holy See is unbounded; he is a man of strong principles; his unbending, almost obstinate firmness, leaves no room to suspect him of frailty. One must own that he is a priest whom one must respect and admire—a man of great political sagacity, and of still greater learning.[1]"

Such was the man who was to fling to the winds the principles for which his predecessors had fought and suffered, in order to be reconciled with a kingdom in which the seeds of death were ingrained, for it was a kingdom born in sin. He was to abandon, as Pope, what he had defended as Bishop of Perugia, and more recently as Camerlengo of a Conclave in which he had joined with the whole Sacred College in protesting against the usurpations of that kingdom. The first public act of his pontificate showed how consistent his conduct would be. His first blessing as Pope was given to the people inside, not outside St. Peter's. Had the Holy Father taken the latter course, the whole reptile press of Italy would have shrieked out that Leo XIII. had cast overboard the policy of Pius IX.[2] But rumors of reconciliation persisted. Those who spread them were the last to credit them. They were sown as tare among the wheat, to distract and divide the faithful. Leo XIII.'s Easter gift of 1878 to the world, his Encyclical *Inscrutabili Dei*, in which he foreshadowed all the great acts of his reign, dismayed and unmasked the rumor mongers. By it the new Pope asserted the rights and freedom of the Holy See. Leo XIII., renewed in it "all the declarations and protestations of every kind which our predecessor of holy memory, Pius IX., has many times issued and repeated against the seizure of the civil dominions, and against the violation of the rights which belong to the Roman Church. All these We too by this Our Letter do altogether renew and confirm." And he expressed the hope that "We may be

[1] I. 197.

[2] I., 189.

restored to that old condition of things in which the counsels of Divine Wisdom had long ago placed the Popes of Rome."

Could anything be clearer or stronger? But that all might understand this better, the Pope almost immediately repeated his protests when appointing Cardinal Nina his Secretary of State, and when proclaiming the Jubilee of 1881. Nevertheless, rumors of reconciliation continued to crop up. They are, in truth, as straws at which the drowning grasp, and are most afloat when the tide of Italian miseries rises highest. Even Italy's "strong man," Signor Crispi, does not disdain them, but he has sought to attribute their being set afloat to the Pope. This assertion, made in the *Contemporary Review*, Mgr. de T'Serclaes shows to be utterly unfounded. Any reconciliation, as Leo XIII. has again and again pointed out, is impossible unless it restores to the Pope his sovereign independence. The form it must take has been sketched by a noble Piedmontese Senator of the Italian Kingdom, Count Castagnetto, when protesting against the infamous Zanardelli Code. "All religious questions apart," he said, "I maintain my opinion that it would be far more advantageous for Italy to reconcile itself with the Apostolic See, and to carry back its capital to the splendid city of Florence." Even those who fought for Italian unity now believe that a mistake was made when Rome was fixed on as the capital of the kingdom. One of Garibaldi's old companions in arms, General Türr, proposed to settle the Roman question by connecting the Vatican with the sea by means of a ship canal, giving the Pope free communication with the rest of the world. In 1887 another Garibaldian, Fazzari, resigned his seat in the Italian Chamber because that body was not in touch with the constituencies in their longing for a reconciliation with the Holy See. He added that he would not seek re-election until the Pope allowed Catholics to take part in parliamentary elections. Later on, in face of overwhelming taxes, financial scandals, famine, and miseries of all kinds, the Italian press least favorable to the rights of the Holy See, began to bewail Italy's unhappy state. The *Messagero* lamented that things were not as they had been before the taking of Rome. The *Don Chisciotte* owned that everything had been sacrificed to gain Rome and despoil the Pope. The *Nuova Antologia* almost confessed that God was punishing Italy for its crimes! The *Folchetto* thought it was time to make a breach at Porta Pia in contrary direction to that of 1870. The influential Liberal paper, the *Corriere di Napoli* advised a return journey from the Pantheon, tomb of Victor Emanuel, to the Superga, the family vault of the House of Savoy. But official Italy remains obdurate. "As for territory," wrote ex-Minister Bonghi in the *Nuova Antologia*, "Italy cannot give back to the Pope a big, nor even a little slice."

At most Italy has only offered its inacceptable Law of Guarantees and vaguely hinted at obtaining an international sanction for it. And on every occasion King Humbert has been made to proclaim the conquest of Rome as sacred [*intangibile*].[1]

It was expected by many, even by Catholics, that Leo XIII. would withdraw the Holy See's prohibition, so tersely expressed in the celebrated Abbé Margotti's phrase, *nê eletti, nê elettori*, against Italian Catholics taking part in the parliamentary elections of the Italian kingdom. In a brief to Duke Salviati, head of the Catholic societies of Italy, dated May 3, 1878, Leo XIII., however, confirmed the prohibition by approving the abstentionist policy of those societies. Count Masino's attempt to form a National Conservative party with Catholic help came to nothing because the prohibition was kept in force. In short, this prohibition, as a pamphlet issued by the *Civiltà Cattolica* shows, was ratified in no less than sixty-two Papal documents between the years 1878 and 1889, for "reasons of a very high order," as Leo XIII. expressed it in speaking to the Federation of Catholic Societies of Rome on April 24, 1881. One such reason is suggested by words the Holy Father spoke to the Sacred College in 1879: "Always ready to stretch forth a helping hand to such as return repentant and with good will to the bosom of the Church and cease to attack her, We shall continue to combat those who war against her, and We shall persevere firmly and constantly in defending her rights, her independence and her liberty." To allow Italian Catholics to take part in parliamentary elections would be to stretch forth a friendly hand to those who have not ceased to attack the Church. Official Italy feels more keenly than anybody the truth of the Pope's words that "the public affairs of Italy can never prosper nor enjoy lasting peace until, as all justice requires, provision has been made for the dignity and freedom of the Sovereign Pontiff," and thinks, by securing Catholic help in elections, to shore up its tottering fabric.

Nothing is more striking in this life of Leo. XIII. than the earnestness with which he desires that Italy should reconcile itself with the Holy See; how his patriotic heart longs that it "should be converted and live." How little, too, does the Holy Father ask—only that provision should be made for the dignity and freedom of the Holy See—that the Roman Pontiff should enjoy a sovereign independence. When will the really strong statesman arise that will free the princes of Savoy from the shackles the Masonic lodges have laid on them, and in the name of Italy shall say with the prodigal son: "I will arise and I will go to my

[1] I., 444; II., 192.

Father." Let those who have at heart the interests of Italy ponder over all that "the first of Italians," as his countrymen have called Leo XIII., has spoken or written about Italy and all Italy owes to the Popes. There is no grander page of historical writing than that of the Pope's Encyclical *Etsi Nos*, in which he sets forth all Italy owes to the Popes; how they defended her against barbarians and Turks; how art flourished under their patronage; how one in faith the Italians enjoyed a real and peaceful unity. The power to civilize and pacify, adds Leo XIII., the Church and the Pope have not lost, for they are the necessary results of Catholic teachings.[1]

We have enumerated above the chief glories of the first sixteen years of the pontificate of Leo XIII. Let us briefly enumerate the many infamies of the Italian government during those same years. Truly, as Mgr. de T'Serclaes remarks, "the history of modern Italy is indeed a sad history." Italy has put every difficulty and delay in the way of newly appointed bishops receiving the *exequatur*, and even went so far as to cite Mgr. Ruffo-Scilla before the courts for using the title of archbishop before he had received the *exequatur*. The state has claimed the right to dispose of sacred edifices; to pass judgment, as in the Martinucci case, on claims made against the Sovereign Pontiff; to force the Propaganda to convert its funds into Italian consols; to abolish tithes. It has attempted to secularize the schools of the Italian missions in the east, but the Marquis di Rudini had the good sense to stop this secularization. But its masterpiece has been the Zanardelli Penal Code, of which Leo XIII. said that "it directly attacked the rights of the Catholic clergy and indirectly the rights of the Apostolic See." But there is no necessity to insist on these things. The infamies of official Italy are well known to our readers.

It is sometimes asked even by some Catholics, why the Pope should not be satisfied with things as they are? They see him enjoying full freedom of communication with the faithful; they go to Rome and behold him amid the pomp and ceremony of a court; they find him dwelling in a palace amid the treasures of art and literature; they walk the streets of Rome during some jubilee-tide and are amazed because all men's minds seem bent on the Vatican and nobody seems to heed the luckless king in his stolen palace on the Quirinal.

Appearances are too often deceptive and so it is with the apparently happy position of the Pope in his own city. The tourist or pilgrim to the Vatican, struck by the pomp, the vastness, the wealth of the palace does not know that the Italian government regards the Pope as a mere tenant at will of the Vatican palace. The boasted Law of Guarantees only gives to the Pope "the free en-

[1] I., 216, 255, 359.

joyment" of it. The official organs always speak of it as if it were national property. When in 1890, Leo XIII., crossing from one part of his palace to another, was supposed to have traversed a bit of Italian territory, a controversy arose on the subject in the Italian press. The official organ hastened on behalf of the Italian ministry to deny that there was any such thing as Pontificial territory in contradistinction to Italian territory and that at best the Pope only enjoyed that extra territoriality granted to the residence of certain foreign diplomatic officials. And so little does the Italian government recognize that the Pope has even the usufruct of his palace that Signor Crispi's paper, the "Riforma," threatened government interference when at the close of 1890, the prefect of the Apostolic Palaces ordered a small entry fee to be levied on visitors to the Vatican museums. Italian insolence went even to the absurd extreme of putting Leo XIII. on the electoral lists of 1890, and of convoking him as an elector under the number 3140, as "Pecci, Joachim, son of Lewis, deceased, residing in Rome." And gossip, which it is to be hoped for the sake of the royal personage is not true, attributes to the king of Italy his speaking of the Pope as *Il Vecchio della Locanda del Vaticano.* But the very pettiness of these insults recoils on their authors.[1]

How truly intolerable is the Pope's position in Rome is clearly shown by two or three scandalous scenes which have taken place in the city during the present pontificate and of which Mgr. de T'Serclaes presents us with graphic accounts. One he thus describes:

"It had been decided," writes the author, "by consent of the civil authorities, that during the night of July 13, 1881, the remains of Pius IX., should be transferred with the greatest secrecy to the place he had chosen for his burial. The government had objected to this being done solemnly, thus giving a fresh proof of the freedom and security the Papacy enjoys in Rome under the Italians. In spite of all precautions, the secret became known to the public, so that at midnight an immense crowd had collected on the square before St. Peter's to pay a last mark of respect to the great Pius IX. A plain hearse and three carriages made up the funeral procession which was followed and surrounded by a whole people. As it passed on its way, houses were spontaneously illuminated and flowers thrown on it from the open windows. One hundred thousand persons, according to hostile estimations, formed the escort of honor to the remains of Pius the Great, and countless torches lit up the scene. It was the posthumous triumph of the Pontiff who had died a victim of the revolution which

[1] II., 155, 157, and 160.

had tried him with all manner of insults and sorrows. Such a scene excited the anger of the sects and soon a band of rioters attacked the funeral with insulting cries and violently threatened to throw the body of Pius IX. into the Tiber. At first the police seem inclined to put a stop to the disorder, but soon ceased any effective efforts and all along the great distance that separates St. Peter's from San Lorenzo, the procession passed along amid curses, blasphemies, and the blows of a few hundred wretches. The Catholics moved on in order, disdaining with admirable patience to take notice of their assailants, though many Catholics were injured."[1]

However much we may admire the almost too Christian forebearance of a hundred thousand persons in presence of a few hundred roughs, it is difficult to relish it. It evokes the feeling that filled Clovis when he heard the narrative of the Crucifixion read. "Would that I had been there with my Franks." But had the Catholics of Rome retaliated, the armed force would undoubtedly have treated them as having given provocation. But all Italy not under the thumb of the Masonic Lodges protested and millions of signatures were appended to the protest, while 20,000 Italian pilgrims came to offer consolation to the Pope. And in the energetic protest which Leo XIII. made against this outrage on the memory of his predecessor, he pointed out the lesson it taught. "Let the Catholic world learn from it what security is left us in the Eternal City. . . . It will be more and more clearly understood that we can now only reside in Rome as a prisoner in the Vatican."

The revolution not seldom overreaches itself when it affords the world such object-lessons as that which it gave on the night when it danced with almost cannibal delight around the august remains of Pius IX. Seven years later, on May 9, 1889, it indulged in another such lesson when it exalted among its gods the apostate monk, Giordano Bruno, by erecting his statue in the center of the city of the Popes. The whole story of Bruno's life, of his tragic yet well-deserved end on the pile in the Campo dei Fiori in Rome, is succinctly and clearly set forth by Mgr. de T'Serclaes. In spite of the opposition of the Municipal Council of Rome to granting a site for the apostate's statue; in spite of a certain half-heartedness of the Italian ministry; in spite of the refusal of the university students of Berlin and of the official interdiction of the Austrian students to take part in the ceremony of unveiling the statue, this was at last carried out. From all parts of Italy, the followers of Satan poured into Rome, to glorify Giordano Bruno and as the *Tribuna* proclaimed, to uphold before the world "the

[1] I., 357.

dignity of Rome, the sacred (*intangible*) capital of united Italy." Let Mgr. de T'Serclaes describe what then took place:

"All the anti-clerical societies, municipalities, universities attached to the Masonic Lodges, and all kinds of sects had sent their delegates to swell the crowd that inundated the streets of the capital of Christendom. Terrible spectacle! There were thousands of men eaten up with hatred of God and of His Church. Never had the world seen such a gathering of the impious. More than six thousand societies were said to have been represented at this gathering of the impious. Some of these groups no doubt were formed for the occasion, but, even so, the number of bodies regularly organized to war against the Church was sufficiently alarming. This attempt to mobilize the forces of hell, this review of the army of Satan seemed as if it were a forerunner of the reign of him who shall rise up against God, the reign of Antichrist. . . . The procession they formed comprised ninety-seven bands of music and nineteen hundred and seventy banners grouped around a horrible standard on which Satan, the real hero of the day, was depicted. As the procession passed before the barracks of St. Catherine, the guard presented arms as if to render military honors to the demon—the chief of Masonic Italy. This fact was denied but seems authentic."

The real Romans held aloof from this satanic demonstration. Except for the procession, the streets were silent and deserted; no flags or signs of rejoicing were displayed; the military precautions taken to protect the Vatican gave the city the aspect of a place in a state of siege. What a contrast with the city a few days later, when in honor of Saints Peter and Paul every house with few exceptions was illuminated. It was a noble counter-demonstration which atoned for the triumph of Satan in the streets of Rome, and for the blasphemous cries, which, for days, the government had allowed to ring within its walls. While government organs, such as the *Capitan Fracassa* rejoiced over the Giordano Bruno demonstration, "as having killed the very soul of the Church," Signor Crispi and his colleagues feared they had allowed things to go too far. They dreaded that the Pope might in face of such insults leave Rome. Mgr. de T'Serclaes tells how they set the police spies to watch all the issues of the Vatican, and redoubled that vigilance which, as our author states, does not permit the Holy Father to walk in his garden without being watched by King Humbert's police.[1]

But Leo XIII. did not take a step which assuredly would have hastened the downfall of the Italian kingdom. He knows that the Holy See can afford to wait. In face of the ever renewed insults

[1] II., 154.

directed against his person and office, he addressed a fresh encyclical letter to the Italians on October 15, 1890, and that it might be understood by all, wrote in their tongue, "Were it only a question of ourself," he said, "if we did not see Italy menaced in its faith and rushing to its ruin, we should suffer in silence such offences." Then further on he pointed out how desirable from an Italian point of view it was that Italy should reconcile itself with the Holy See. "This conflict with the Holy See not only deprives Italy abroad of that prestige w ich peace with the Papacy would most certainly give it, but it estranges from it the whole Catholic world, imposes on it great burdens, and on the slightest pretext would give its enemies a weapon against itself." After pointing out all that Italy would gain by restoring to the Pontiff his independence and his sovereignty, the Pope concludes by showing that it is a calumny "to denounce Catholics and the Pontiff as enemies of Italy."

Very soon again a fresh outrage saddened the paternal heart of Leo XIII. This was the undoubtedly premeditated ill-treatment of the French pilgrims in October, 1892, and the cynical and hypocritical language of the Italian government about it. These had one happy result, for they called forth words from the Austrian Chancellor, Count Kalnoky, in the Austrian delegations, that showed that the Roman question was not closed. He called it "a difficult problem of which a satisfactory solution has not yet been found."

It were idle to speculate what that satisfactory solution will be unless we

> "Can look into the seeds of time,
> And say which grain will grow and which will not."

With Mgr. de T'Serclaes we can only hint at the possible solution. "The day of [Italy's] break-up is perhaps not far off. Its unity will then crumble of itself into anarchy, but order will not be restored on the principle of unity, but on the federal principle, and not without the Pontiff, but under his auspices and with his assistance."[1] With an earnest prayer that Italy may soon be converted and live, we take leave of Mgr. de T'Serclaes volumes, merely adding that they are a mine of information about contemporary history. The eight chapters devoted to the Pope's action in the politico-religious affairs of France are of especial interest and value.

WILFRID C. ROBINSON.

BRUGES, BELGIUM.

[1] II., 179.

"QUID MIHI ET TIBI, MULIER?"

THE writer begs to submit a brief exposition of John ii., 4, as he understands this vexed passage.

In the first place, no honest man will find a difficulty in the appellation of "Mulier" applied by Christ to his Blessed Mother. In the Syro-Chaldaic tongue, which Jesus spoke, this was the accustomed manner of address to any woman and manifested no want of respect or tenderness. Christ uses the same address to Mary Magdalen at the tomb on the morning of the Resurrection. In judging of such remote events we cannot take for a criterion our social code; we must clothe them with the circumstances and social customs of the time; we must pay heed also to the idiom of the language in which they were first chronicled. As there exists no radical difference between Syro-Chaldaic and Hebrew, we may turn to the latter as the basic text in our present consideration.

The phrase was an *idiom*, and the cardinal point is to determine *what exact shade of meaning it was intended to convey in the language in which it first had origin.* The idiom occurs in Judges xi., 12, where Jephte sends to the king of Ammon demanding: "מַה-לִּי וְלָךְ." Prescinding from the idiomatic meaning, the words are correctly reproduced in Greek by: "*Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί;*" and in Latin by: "Quid mihi et tibi?" The idea, however, produced by such words in the Greek or Latin mind would not be the same as that caused in the Hebrew mind by the same words, for such is the force of an idiom that it is frequently lost by translation. Modern languages differ somewhat in reproducing this phrase. The German version of D'Allioli renders it as it occurs in St. John by: "Weib, was habe ich mit dir zu schaffen?" which might be rendered in English by: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" The French and Italian are identical in signification: "Femme, qu'y a-t-il entre vous et moi?" and "Donna, che vi ha tra te e me?" In English the meaning of these words would be: "Woman, what is there between you and me?" The passage in King James' version is: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" which is evidently not a translation, but an interpretation, and, as we shall endeavor to prove, a very bad one. The Rheims-Douay version, as corrected by Challoner, is: "Woman, what is to me and to thee?" In some versions of the Rheims version is found: "Woman, what is *that* to me and to thee?" The introduction of

"that" here is an interpretation and completely perverts the signification of the phrase.

To one with even a smattering of Hebrew and Greek it is evident that Challoner's text surpasses every other modern version in the literal reproduction of the original texts. We consider the Greek in the present case as an original text, because St. John, in his Gospel, reproduced in Greek the Saviour's words spoken in Aramaic. But Challoner's version, although literal, labors under the disadvantage that, owing to the strangeness of the idiom, it conveys no clear-cut idea to our minds. The other versions, in attempting to remove this strangeness, have given us interpretations instead of translations, the words of men instead of the words of Christ. We prefer, then, the vagueness to the false concept conveyed by all the other versions. Discarding, then, all other versions, we will endeavor to bring out the Hebrew idiom, though clothed in English words, as rendered by Challoner's text.

All such phrases have a *great, general signification, which becomes modified by the context in its different applications.* We place, then, as our foundation, in dealing with this expression, that *by it the one speaking demands a reason for some action or tenor of conduct directed towards himself*—that is, the one uttering those words asks a cause for the line of action which the person addressed is adopting towards the speaker. Now, it depends on the context whether an indignant expostulation or calm interrogation be conveyed by the words. In the passage in Judges, referred to in the beginning, Jephte asks cause why the king of Ammon should make war upon him and devastate his land. The basic sense of the words, that we have determined above, fits exactly here: Jephte asks cause for a line of action used towards him. Similarly, in II. Samuel, xvi., 10 (commonly called Second Kings), where Abisai, the son of Sarvia, would slay Semei, who was cursing David, the holy king demands reason for such slaying in this exact phrase: "Quid mihi et vobis, filii Sarvia?" This, in the present case, would be equivalent to saying in our tongue: "Why such actions towards me, O sons of Sarvia?" Evidently the words here convey no harshness or disrespect, as they are addressed to one of David's own defenders, who, through zeal for the king's honor, would slay his opponent. They express, it is true, disapproval, but the disapproval of the suggestion of a zealous friend. The words in the same sense are again directed towards Abisai in the 22d verse of the xix. chapter of the same book.

A yet more striking example of the fundamental signification is found in I. Kings, xvii., 18 (III. Kings, xvii., 18). Elias is harbored by the widow of Sarephta. Her son falls ill, and it soon appears that a mortal disease is preying upon his vitals. The grief-

stricken mother turns to Elias, and, attributing the cause of her son's death to his presence, asks concerning his action towards her in this idiom: "Quid mihi et tibi, vir Dei?" Here the expression under consideration can admit of no other interpretation than that of being an interrogation to know the cause of the line of action which the speaker believed to be practiced towards herself. In II. Kings, iii., 13 (IV. Kings, iii., 13), when Joram, king of Israel, sought to know from Eliseus the event of his war against Moab, the prophet made answer: "Quid mihi et tibi est? Vade ad prophetas patris tui et matris tuae." Here Eliseus asks with scorn why the idolatrous king of Israel should come to him, and we could render the sense of the sentence by: "What wouldst thou of me?" or, "Why comest thou to me? Go to the prophets of thy father and thy mother." The scorn here is not essentially implied in the phrase, but results from the context.

In the second book of Paralipomenon, xxxv., 21, the same expression appears in its unvarying fundamental signification, but the tone is conciliatory. Nechao, king of Egypt, sends a friendly message to Josias, king of Juda, advising him that he is not making war upon him and asks, in the oft-quoted phrase, why Josias is assembling hosts to make head against him. The only places where the idiom occurs in the New Testament, besides the one under consideration, is where the demons address our Lord, who is about to eject them from the energumens. In every one of these passages, Math. viii., 29, Luke viii., 28, iv., 34, Mark i., 24, v., 7, the demons ask concerning Jesus' conduct towards them.

There is a mingling of railing hate and despair in the phrase in the mouths of the demons, but this is accidental, not from the essential nature of the words. After the consideration of all these texts, we repeat our fundamental position that the phrase asks a cause for the line of action which the one addressed employs towards the speaker. This basic meaning would be naturally by the context shaded and drawn to cognate meanings springing from the original signification. We have seen clear evidence that its tone may be scornful or conciliatory, angry or friendly, in different circumstances.

We come now to examine the text of St. John, in the light of our previous scrutiny. We shall apply the fundamental signification to the phrase as it there occurs. The wine at the marriage-feast has failed, and as Mary was one of the inner circle of friends, the defect is made known to her. Knowing her Son's almighty power, she approaches Him, and makes known to Him the distressing occurrence. She plainly, by her action, shows forth that she believes that, if He will, He can afford a remedy. There is a quaint beauty in Mary's words: "They have no wine." The full

extent of Mary's relations with Jesus, we, upon this bank and shoal of time, can never know. How much she shared of the thoughts and designs of the God-Man is hid and barred from mortal sense. Although the field of conjecture be vast, we will refrain: conjectures help not in a scientific interpretation. But it seems not conjecture to say that Mary knew that her Son could supply the failing wine, else why her bootless message to Him? Impelled then by such conviction, she comes to Him and announces the simple fact. Now this can be called *Mary's line of action* for which Jesus asks cause, and as we have already shown, his asking cause for such action implies not by virtue of the phrase any repulse. We will venture to here place in Christ's mouth what we believe to have actuated Him in His response to Mary: "O, woman, why comest thou to me in this need? Thou knowest that only by appealing to my almighty power could I remedy this defect. Now the time has not yet come to establish my title to the coequal Sonship of God, by manifestations of my divine power. I have not became Incarnate to work miracles for the advantage of our kinsfolk and acquaintances. The divine design, in harmony with which my human will always works, is that I remain hid until my entrance on my public life. Then I will perform works so that I can say, 'if ye believe not my words, believe my works.' But these miracles shall be performed for no private end or emolument, but to prove that the Father and I are one in nature as we are one in power." These words though said ostensibly to Mary, were said to us. We were the ones to be taught the scope of Christ's miracles.

Had Christ not performed the miracle we could rest here. But Mary takes the answer for an affirmation, and Christ, in seeming contradiction to his words, changeth the water into wine. Before answering this heavy objection, we take for granted the truth of the mystery of mysteries, the harmonious concurrence of man's free will and God's eternal prescience, and consequent eternal decrees. Christ as man was endowed with free will; free, while always in consonance with His divine will. He was free, therefore, to begin His public life when He should please. When, therefore, He says to Mary, that His time was not yet come, He means this in relation to the *end* for which His miracles should be wrought. He does not imply that there was any absolute fixed date, before which He could not begin His public life; but rather that His miracle-working should be a part and factor in the great drama of Redemption, and not for private ends done in the interest of his family or friends. It was a fitting preface to the wondrous deed to show our dull senses that Christ worked those wonders not for private interests, but as a necessary element in the

economy of salvation. Being free, then, to begin at any time, He began His public life with this miracle, as St. John says: "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and He manifested His glory, and His disciples believed in him." We say then that Jesus, who was free to begin His public life at any time, began it here at Mary's solicitation; that He prefaced the miracle by a solemn declaration that it was not for private ends, but as a factor in the scheme of Redemption; and that Mary understood Him perfectly and acted in accordance. We believe that this is an adequate explanation of the difficulty in the second clause. Were it necessary, we might go further and say, that even though Jesus had not intended to begin His public life at that particular time, He changed his mind at Mary's petition, and anticipated, by a short period, the point at which He would otherwise have begun. Once we assert Christ's free human will, this must result; for there can be no liberty without exemption from necessity. We are confirmed in this view by the fact that the best exegetists held that Christ after His resurrection changed His mind in regard to the place of appearing to the Apostles. On the morning of His Resurrection, He says to Mary Magdalen and the other Mary (Math. xxvii., 10): "Fear not, go ye, announce to the brethren that they go into Galilee, *there* they shall see me." The angel also in Mark, xvi., 7, affirms the same: "But go say to the disciples and Peter that he (Jesus), goes before you into Galilee, *there* you shall see Him as He said to you." Jesus had promised this (Mark xiv., 28): "But after I shall have arisen, I will go before you into Galilee." But contrary to all these promises, Jesus first appeared to the Apostles "as they were at table" in Jerusalem (Luke xxiv., 33, 36). The only satisfactory explanation for this is, that Jesus had originally intended to manifest himself first in Galilee; but, with the freedom of a free moral agent, he changed this first design and appeared first in Jerusalem. And so it results that this verse far from being prejudicial to Mary, exalts her, and brings out more clearly her part in the drama that saved the world.

A. E. Breen, D.D.

Rochester, N. Y.

Scientific Chronicle.

PETROLEUM.

An Historical Sketch.

Probably most of those who have waded through the "Scientific Chronicle" of this Review for October and January last, feel that they have had about enough of oil, perhaps even an over-dose. But having spoken of the animal and vegetable kinds, we cannot bear to tear ourselves entirely away from the subject of oils without at least a word on the third and last kind, the so-called mineral oil. Relying therefore on the well-known patience of our readers, we feel that we may venture to administer just one mild dose more. We have, however, for the consolation of all concerned, registered a solemn promise that this infliction shall be the last in this matter.

The word *Petroleum*, derived from the Latin, *petrae oleum* (oil of the rock), has been used by many writers in a very wide sense to embrace every kind of bituminous substance found in the earth, whether solid, semi-solid, liquid, or gaseous. Others, however, apply the term to the liquid forms only, and use the word *Bitumen* for the generic name of the semi-solids, and *Asphaltum* for the solids. In the nomenclature of the subject there has been at times considerable confusion. We shall try to clear it up, to some extent, in the following table, which has been made out with the aid of the best authorities at hand, and it is probably fairly correct, as far as it goes.

This list, though incomplete, will, we think, enable us to recognize our substance almost anywhere, and that is all we need so far.

To enter into the details of the physical and chemical properties of petroleum, of its mode of occurrence, its origin, its uses, etc., however interesting it might be in itself, would require a good many issues of this Review all to itself. Men, it is true, are born selfish (except when they happen to be twins), and they hardly ever get entirely cured; but we are not quite selfish enough to wish to monopolize the Review, and so we shall stick to our title: "An Historical Sketch."

The literature is quite extensive. Ever since the days of Herodotus (450 B. C.) we find an almost continuous stream of authors, some of whom have merely mentioned the matter in passing, while from the pens of others have come long treatises showing careful and patient investigations. It has even been stated that long before the time of Herodotus, mention is made of petroleum in the Bible. Whether indeed the Bible is the first to mention it, or even whether the Bible mentions it at all, is not a matter of much consequence, but the choice of the text intended to illustrate the assertion seems to have been a very unhappy one.

Tongue.	Liquid.	Semi-Solid.	Solid.
Hebrew	.....	.....	Hemar, kofer.
Babylonian	.....	.....	Mur, aschir.
Persian	Rhadinance, nafta, nafata, naphtha, neftgil.	.....	.....
Assyrian	.....	.....	Kupru, amaru, ididu.
Syrian	.....	.....	Abu thabun.
Greek	.....	Asphaltos.	.....
Roman	Bitumen liquidum, bitumen candidum, naphtha flos bituminis, petroleum.	Pittolium, pissasphaltus, maltha, bitumen,	.....
Arabian	Hara sakir,	.....	Chumel, humar, el humar.
Indian	Yenan.	.....	.....
Japanese	Sakinoyn, seki-schitza.	.....	Dore, kioei, teire, kisa.
Chinese	Schi-yu.	.....	.....
Spanish	Petroleo.	Brea.	.....
Slavonian	Ropa, ropianka.	Kendebal.	Smola.
Roumanian	Pekureti,	.....	....
German	Erdoel, steinoel, naphta, petroleum.	.....	Erdhartz, erdpech, asphatt. Judenpech.
French	Bitume liquide, huile naphthe, huile de petrole.	Bitume visqueux, bitume glutineux, poix mineral, mineral graisse.	Goudron mineral, bitume compacte, asphalte.
English	Rock oil, naphtha, earth oil, mineral oil, crude oil.	Earth tar, mineral tar, maltha, pitch, bitumen.	Mineral wax, mineral pitch, asphaltum, ozokerite.

The case is thus stated by William T. Brannt in his recent work on "Petroleum:" "The first notice of it (petroleum) we find in the Bible, it being stated in the Second Book of Maccabees, Chapter I., that when the Jews were led into Persia they found pits in which the priests concealed the sacred fire they required for their sacrifices. After many years their grandchildren, contemporaries of the prophet Nehemiah, searched for the concealed fire and found an oil which, when poured on the hot sacrificial stone, burst into a huge flame. The Jews enclosed these pits, and, designating them holy, applied to them the term *nephtar* or *neptoj*, a place of expiation or forgiveness, from which the word *naphtha* is derived."

In spite of that "huge flame," this account is, to say the least, cool; we might even call it refreshing. Though not much given to polemics, we think this covert attack on the veracity of the Sacred Scriptures should not be allowed to pass without a challenge, and hence in the interest of the truth only we don our coat-of-mail just here. To properly understand the whole case, it will be necessary to quote from the reference given above the two passages which bear on the subject. They are contained in the five verses (18 to 22) and the six verses (31 to 36) inclusively: "Therefore whereas we purpose to keep the purification of the temple on the five and twentieth day of the month of Casleu, we

thought it necessary to signify it to you: that you also may keep the day of Scenopegia, the day of the fire, that was given when Nehemias offered sacrifice, after the temple and altar was built. For when our fathers were led into Persia, the priests that then were worshippers of God, took privately the fire from the altar, and hid it in a valley where there was a deep pit without water, and there they kept it safe, so that the place was unknown to all men. But when many years had passed, and it pleased God that Nehemias should be sent by the king of Persia, he sent some of the posterity of those priests that had hid it to seek for the fire: and as they told us, they found no fire, but thick water. Then he bade them draw it up, and bring it to him: and the priest Nehemias commanded the sacrifices that were laid on, to be sprinkled with the same water, both the wood and the things that were laid on it. And when this was done, and the time was come that the sun shone out, which before was in a cloud, there was a great fire kindled, so that all wondered. . . . . And when the sacrifice was consumed, Nehemias commanded the water that was left to be poured upon the great stones. Which being done, there was kindled a flame from them; but it was consumed by the light that shined from the altar. And when this matter became public, it was told to the king of Persia, that in the place where the priests that were led away had hid the fire, there appeared water, with which Nehemias and they that were with him had purified the sacrifices. And the king considering, and diligently examining the matter, made a temple for it, that he might prove what had happened. And when he had proved it, he gave the priests many goods, and divers presents, and he took and distributed them to them with his own hand. And Nehemias called this place Nephthar, which is interpreted purification." (Douay Bible.)

This account differs, as will be perceived, in several important particulars, from the one given by our author. In the first place, Brannt says that those who were sent to seek for the fire found an *oil*, while the Bible says they found "*thick water*," *aquam crassam*. Now Brannt's work is published in Philadelphia, and the author should surely have known that even Schuylkill water, which has the reputation of being pretty thick at times, is never, even at its worst, called "oil." Still we do not want to lay any undue stress on this, and we freely admit that the word water is sometimes used in the general sense of "liquid." We let that pass, therefore, and come to the next point, which is more serious.

In the second place, the Bible says that this thick water was thrown on the wood and on the offerings, and that when the sun came out it took fire. Brannt conveniently passes over this statement without mentioning it at all. He probably saw that it would be too difficult to find an oil which would take fire by mere exposure to sunlight. We are not aware that such an oil has ever been heard of, and we can afford to wait calmly for further information. We have, it is true, some very inflammable oils derived from petroleum, the vapors of which in the open air would burst into flame from the touch of a lighted match, or from the

spark of a steel and flint; but if merely poured on a wood-pile, instead of setting it on fire, they would evaporate so rapidly as to cool the wood down very considerably. About this no physicist can have the ghost of a doubt.

Thirdly, Brannt states that the oil was poured on the hot sacrificial stone. We would like to know how that stone came to be hot, especially as the Jews were not allowed to make any other fire before the sacred fire had been first kindled. Was it perchance because the day, as the Bible says, had been cloudy up to the moment of the sacrifice? It would seem to require a very unscientific use of the imagination to invent such a folly as that. No, there must have been a fire to heat the stone, if, as Brannt says, it *was* hot. Of course, if there had been such a fire previously, and if any little flame still remained, even crude petroleum might be ignited thereby, but the difficulty just now is about what started the first fire, and this is not solved by slyly ignoring it.

Fourthly, the Bible evidently records the occurrence as a miracle, for in this account, the Jews of Jerusalem were writing to their brethren of Egypt and exhorting them to keep (holy) the day of the fire that was given when Nehemias offered sacrifice; and the Jews everywhere have kept it holy ever since. It would be altogether too absurd to imagine that a festival was instituted for the perpetual remembrance of the fact that a highly inflammable oil took fire when set on fire by another fire already kindled. Again, "there was a great fire kindled, so that all wondered." Truly, it is no wonder that they wondered, believing, as they evidently did, that the liquid was real water. But even if it had been petroleum, the materialistic view of the case would not be advanced one bit, for, once again, no one ever heard of petroleum taking fire spontaneously.

Another statement which shows that the whole occurrence was miraculous is contained in verse 32, where it is said that the flame which rose from the stones was consumed by the light that shined from the altar, that is, there shone from the altar itself a glory which overpowered the light from the burning liquid, whatever that liquid may have been.

Such being the case, the affair naturally caused a stir abroad, and was looked upon as so remarkable that the king of Persia himself, Artaxerxes Longimanus, who was no fool, thought it worth his while to investigate the matter, and he did so, thoroughly. After diligent examination and careful consideration, he was satisfied as to the truth of the reports which had been brought to him, and especially as to the fact that it was water and not oil that had been used. He thereupon built a temple (an enclosure) around the spring to preserve it as a holy place, and then with his own hand distributed many valuable presents to the priests, in order to honor those whom Jehovah had honored by a double miracle.

"And Nehemias called this place Nephthar which is interpreted purification." The Septuagint calls the *substance*, not the *place*, Nephthar, but that is immaterial. Several explanations of this part of the text have been offered, one of which is the following: The Jews, during their captivity in Babylon, where petroleum, both in the solid and the

liquid state, had long been known, had seen the pagans employ it in their sacrificial rites, and had seen it set on fire. They had become acquainted with the word *naphthar*, or *nephtar*, or whatever word the Babylonians then used for petroleum, and so when Nehemias saw the liquid which he poured on the offerings take fire, he very naturally employed the term which he had heard employed on similar occasions in Babylon. The Babylonian word *naphthar* did not mean "forgiveness," but came from the Persian or Median word *nafata* or *neftgil*, "*to exude.*"

One more remark, and we have done with this. William Smith in his "Dictionary of the Bible" (art. Naphthar), says that the place from which the liquid in question was drawn "has been identified with the large well called by the Arabs, Bir-eyub, situated beneath Jerusalem, at the confluence of the valleys of Kidron and Hinnon with the Wady-en-Nar (valley of fire), and from which the main water supply of the city is obtained." The water supply of a city drawn from a petroleum spring! That is a little too strong. This well is just a step or two southeast of Jerusalem. It is now called En-Rogel, and on good authority, has, ever since the days of Josue, either contained water or has been dry, according to the season. We can find no account in history of the finding of petroleum at or near Jerusalem. Therefore the water of Nehemias was water and not petroleum. If, however, we are very anxious to find mention of petroleum in the Bible, we may, perhaps, be satisfied with the text of Job (xxix., 6): "When I washed my feet with butter, and the rock poured me out rivers of oil."

But let us back to business. We had started to say, before we were interrupted by that Bible question, that Herodotus has left on record what he knew about petroleum. He wrote of the springs in the island of Zacynthus, now Zante: "I have myself seen pitch drawn up out of a lake and from water in Zacynthus; and there are several lakes there; the largest of them is seventy feet every way, and two orgyæ (fathoms?) in depth; into this they let down a pole with a myrtle branch fastened to the end, and then draw up pitch adhering to the myrtle; it has the smell of asphalt, but is in other respects, better than the pitch of Pieria. They pour it into a cistern, dug near the lake, and when they have collected a sufficient quantity they pour it off from the cisterns into jars." Again, he says: "Eight days' journey from Babylon stands another city called Is (the modern Hit) on a small river of the same name which discharges its stream into the Euphrates. Now this river brings down with its waters many lumps of bitumen, from whence the bitumen used in the wall of Babylon was brought."

This solid or semi-solid petroleum was used, according to Genesis (xi., 3), as a cement in the building of the tower of Babel, and the same is doubtless true of the glorious palaces of Ninevah. But the springs of Hit supplied also a liquid bitumen, called by the Persians *nafta*, and by the Turks *hara sakir*. These springs are well known even now, and have often been visited by European travellers on the overland journey to the Indies.

Strabo (50 B.C.), tells us about the occurrence of bitumen in the valley of Judea, and how after an earthquake-shock it used to rise, and float in lumps on the surface of the Dead Sea. He likewise tells of the trade in this material kept up by an Arab, named Nabathenes, with the Egyptians, who made use of it in embalming their mummies. Diodorus of Sicily, about the same time, describes the lake Asphaltites, and says that the savages of that island had no other commerce except with the same Egyptians, and that it consisted solely in the traffic in bitumen, or asphalt.

Aristotle (384 B.C.), and Plutarch, Pliny, and Josephus, all in the first century of the Christian era, describe in turn, the deposits of bitumen occurring in Albania on the eastern shores of the Adriatic Sea, while petroleum springs and gas wells have been known in China from time immemorial. The wells of Baku, on the Caspian Sea, with their almost constantly burning streams of oil, have been known for ages, and have been described by many travellers, among others by the celebrated Marco Polo (A.D. 1250); and as we come down to more modern times the references become more numerous, but we must leave them and hurry on.

In North America the early explorers became acquainted with petroleum principally through the Indians. The earliest record we have is that left by the Franciscan missionary, Joseph de la Roche D'Allion, who in 1629 crossed the Niagara River into what is now the State of New York. He makes mention of certain oil springs existing at that spot, and says that the Indian name of the place means "there is plenty there."

Again on a map bearing the date of 1670, a *Fontaine de Bitume* is located near what is now the village of Cuba, N. Y., and oil, as is well known, is found there at the present day.

The Seneca Indians who occupied the southwestern part of New York and the northeastern part of Pennsylvania, set great value on their springs on Oil Creek and in the neighboring valleys, and used the oil not only as a medicine, but also in their religious observances. The French commander of Fort Duquesne, writing in 1750 to General Montcalm, says: "I would desire to assure you that this is a most delightful land. Some of the most astonishing natural wonders have been discovered by our people. While descending the Allegheny, fifteen leagues below the mouth of the Conewango and three above the Venango, we were invited by the chief of the Senecas to attend a religious ceremony of his tribe. We landed and drew up our canoes on a point where a small stream entered the river. The tribe appeared unusually solemn. We marched up the stream about half a league, where the company, a band it appeared had arrived some days before. Gigantic hills begirt us on every side. The scene was really sublime. The great chief then recited the conquests and heroism of his ancestors. The surface of the stream was covered with a thick scum, which, upon applying a torch at a given signal, burst into a complete conflagration. At the sight of the flames the Indians gave forth the triumphant shout that

made the hills and valleys re-echo again. Here then, is revived the ancient fire worship of the East; here, then, are the children of the sun."

In 1755 Lewis Evans, of Philadelphia, published "A General Map of the Middle Colonies of America," indicating the existence of petroleum along the Allegheny and Ohio rivers, and about the same time, Peter Kalm, a Swede, published a book of travels, in which was a map giving the correct locations of the springs on Oil Creek. Thirty-four years later (1789) in the "Massachusetts Magazine" we find the following: "In the northern part of Pennsylvania is a creek called Oil Creek, which empties into the Allegheny River. It issues from a spring, on which floats an oil similar to that called Barbadoes tar, and from which one may gather several gallons in a day. The troops sent to guard the western posts halted at this spring, collected some of the oil, and bathed their joints with it. This gave them great relief from the rheumatism with which they were afflicted. The water, of which the troops drank freely, operated as a gentle purge."

Somewhat later, but still in the last century, springs of petroleum were discovered in West Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky, according as settlers began to establish themselves beyond the Allegheny mountains. Up to the beginning of the present century, however, little interest was manifested in petroleum, and the commerce in it was a small affair; but between 1800 and 1850 there was a wonderful awakening. Explorers for petroleum girt themselves around and started the echoes in nearly every part of the known world. The consequence was that new sources were discovered, and old ones that had been neglected or forgotten, were rediscovered. Some of these "finds" have yielded and are still yielding immense quantities of oil; others from the outset gave very little promise and kept it faithfully; others that promised well at first, proved to be deficient in staying qualities, and have been abandoned.

About this time also chemists began to examine the oils from different localities, in order to find out something about their composition, and to learn how to purify them so as to rid them of their disagreeable odors, and to separate them into their constituents so as to open up for them uses and applications unknown before. During the decade from 1840 to 1850 both prospecting and analyzing were pushed with remarkable vigor, but the birth of the real petroleum industry did not take place till August 28, 1859, on which date oil was first reached by a well bored for that express purpose. Prior to this time wells had, indeed, been bored, but it was in order to obtain brine for the manufacture of salt.

However, as the wells bored for brine were the legitimate precursors of those that were afterwards bored for oil, we think it well to describe the first boring for salt. It took place in the region now called West Virginia, at the "Salt Lick," otherwise called the "Great Buffalo Lick," on account of the vast herds of buffalo, elk, and other ruminants that came there regularly through "Thoroughfare Gap" for their supply of salt. The Indian name of the place, "Kanawha," has been retained

to the present day. The buffalo discovered the salt, the red man discovered the buffalo, the white man discovered the red man, and having persuaded both him and the buffalo to retire, the white man, under the broad seal of "Squatter Sovereignty," took possession of the salt. It was not solid salt, however, but only salt water, and not very salt at that.

Now, in 1806, the brothers, David and Joseph Ruffner, feeling, as the buffaloes before them had felt, a strong yearning for more salt, undertook to get down to the source, or "first principles" as it were. To do this by open digging was found impossible on account of the oozy nature of the soil through which the brine made its slow way to the surface. The brothers therefore, procured a straight, hollow "gum-tree" (sycamore) of an internal diameter of four feet; having sawn it off square at both ends, they set it in an upright position, and secured it by braces on all sides, thus forming a veritable caisson. A platform on which two men could stand, was built at the top, and a tall post carrying a well-pole or swape, was planted hard by. A whiskey barrel, that had lost its vocation from having become empty, was cut in two, across the middle, and thus supplied the engineers with a couple of large, strong, buckets. One of these was hung in the caisson by a rope fastened to the well-pole, while the other stood by in mute but open-mouthed wonder, waiting for a job, and perhaps reviling the partiality of an all too hollow world. Imagination struggles vainly to portray the feelings of that other bucket when it found itself the very center of so stupendous an enterprise, and mayhap looked down from time to time and despised its less favored brother. Next, a knight in full armor of pick-axe, shovel and crowbar was lowered down to the base of operations in the bottom of the gum tree, while two men were stationed on the platform to empty the bucket, and three or four supplied the energy necessary for working the swape. Ventilation in the caisson seems to have been kept up by vigorous shouting, sometimes on matters totally irrelevant to the work in hand. As the digging progressed, the caisson was of course lowered, until at last it came to anchor on the rock, at a depth of 18 feet. After a deal of trouble, the caisson was made to fit the irregular rock-surface tight enough to exclude outside water, and then it was found that brine, in very small quantities indeed, but fairly pure and strong, was actually coming up through the rock itself. The quality of the brine was encouraging, but the rock was discouraging. The brothers wanted to get down through that rock, but neither Indians nor buffaloes had left any precedent to work by. However, after some severe mental efforts, a new idea was hatched in the brains of the men, and they consequently decided to try drilling. To make a hole, by mere hand-drilling, large enough to be of any service, and to a depth as yet entirely problematical, was of course, out of the question, but the native ingenuity of the men soon hit on the following expedient: the heavy well-pole was discarded, and in its place a light springy one was substituted. To this, was slung a long iron rod, the lower end of which carried a 2½ inch steel chisel-bit. The outer end of the pole was

pulled down by means of a rope in the hands of the workmen. This action raised the drill, and when the rope was released, the drill, bearing the full weight of the rod, fell, and delivered its blow. As the hole became deeper, new lengths of rod were welded on, till, by pegging away patiently for four months and a-half, they reached, on January 15, 1808, a depth of 40 feet in the rock itself, from which now flowed a plentiful supply of strong brine. The success of this undertaking encouraged others, and soon drilling or, as it is often called, boring, became common. We have related this case somewhat in detail, not only because it is the first instance of drilling, in contradistinction to digging, but also because to Kanawha is due the credit of having educated and sent forth skilled well-borers all over the land, who have bored for water for irrigation on the western plains, for artesian wells for city, factory, and private use, for brine in many places, and later on for oil not only in America, but in other parts of the world.

Among those however, who did not go forth, but remained at home, "Billy" Morris must not be forgotten. He had handled many a swape-rope and had noticed that when the boring had reached a certain depth, the long iron drill-rod would get bent by the percussion of its own fall, and hence would bind more or less against the sides of the hole; and that besides when a drill got stuck, it was awfully hard work to loosen it again; and the deeper the hole the worse these difficulties became. Others had often noticed the same thing, and had relieved their feelings by certain unprofessional remarks, more picturesque than ethical, but Billy gathered his wits into a lump, and invented the tool called the "slips" or "jars." They are made like two exaggeratedly long links of a flat chain, fitting closely sideways, but free to slide loosely up and down. They are 6 feet 3 inches long when closed, but stretch out to 7 feet 4 inches when fully opened. Their use will be made known further down.

Though perhaps somewhat out of place logically, we feel the need of inserting at this point such description as we may be able to give of the whole operation of drilling, as it is done in modern practice.

First.—There must be a derrick suitable for handling the various tools. This is usually a square, open structure of heavy timbers, in the form of a pyramid, and measuring about 25 feet each way at the bottom, and 4 or 5 at the top. The helght is about 70 feet. Since a complete "string" of tools is about 60 feet in length, real drilling is not supposed to begin till that depth has been reached. Getting down to that point is considered as mere preparation.

Second.—The derrick being in place, an iron pipe, 8 inches in diameter, shod with sharp steel, is driven, like a pile, down as far as it can be made to go. If this be the full 60 feet, all is well; if more than 60 feet, all the better. Sometimes a depth of 200 feet or more is attained by this drive-pipe alone, and then the oil men smile a smile of sweet content. If, however, the drive-pipe, before reaching the 60 foot horizon, effectually resists the gentle persuasion of the 1-ton wooden maul, a heavy drill, the full size of the bore, is lowered into the pipe. The drill

is then raised a few feet by suitable machinery in the derrick above, and let fall suddenly; and this pounding is kept up till some progress has been made. The pipe is then driven a little further, and this alternation of drilling and pounding goes on till the requisite 60-foot depth is reached. The 8-inch bit is now removed, and the complete string of tools is lowered into the hole. In the following list we give them in their proper order, beginning with the lowest.

Tool.	Length.	Diameter.	Weight.
Drill, or Bit	3 feet 3 inches.	5½ inches.	140 pounds.
Auger Stem	30 "	5½ "	1020 "
Slips, or Jars	7 " 4 "	5½ "	320 "
Sinker Bar	18 "	3½ "	540 "
Rope Socket	3 " 6 "	3½ "	80 "
Rope, or Cable	?	?	?
Temper Screw	4 "	.....	145 "
Total	66 feet 1 inch.	.....	2245 pounds.

Let us now get down to the bottom of that hole, in spirit, and work our way slowly up. The lower end, or cutting portion of the *bit* is a double-beveled chisel of hardened steel. Its upper end is threaded so as to screw into the auger stem above it. The *auger stem*, which is of iron, is threaded in the same way to fit the lower link of the jars. Its object in life is two-fold: first, by its great weight, to help the bit strike an effective blow; secondly, by its length, to serve as a guide for the bit, which, left to its own vagaries, might stray from the road of rectitude and go exploring laterally on its own account. This would never do, since, in order to prevent the ingress of water and sand at points above the oil strata, it is usually necessary to line the hole with iron piping, and a crooked hole could not be so lined. Secondly, even if a well flow oil abundantly at the outset, the flow will almost surely, sooner or later, cease, and then recourse must be had to pumping; but a pump could not be lowered through a crooked hole.

The *jars* come next. The lower half of the jars is screwed fast to the auger stem, and its weight, say 160 pounds, is added to that of the stem and bit, making in all a total striking weight of 1320 pounds. The upper half of the jars is made fast to the sinker bar, but we shall leave the description of their action till we get up out of that hole.

The *sinker bar* is merely an iron rod, whose size and weight have been already given in the table. Its purpose will be made clear in a few moments.

The *rope socket* is an iron tube whose object is to grip the lower two feet of the rope or cable firmly without danger of cutting or chafing it off. This is the only practical way of fastening the rope, as there is not room enough in the hole to bend the rope around an eye and splice it.

Following the rope up we reach the open air and take a breath.

Here we meet the *temper screw*, a very ingenious contrivance for connecting the rope with the *walking beam* which oscillates up and down over the hole. If the rope, properly adjusted as to length, were fastened directly to the walking beam, it would be found too short as soon as the drill had made a few inches of headway. Instead of this arrangement, the rope, which is often nearly ¾ of a mile long, may be gripped at any point of its length by a strong clamp which is fastened to the lower end of the temper screw, while its upper, free portion, runs to the top of the derrick over a pulley there, and then down to a drum, called the *bull wheel*. The purpose of the bull wheel is to lower the string of tools into the hole, or raise them out, as occasion may require. Finally, the top part of the frame in which the temper screw runs is hung on the hook of the walking beam, the screw itself being run up to its highest point.

Let us now adjust our string of tools to the proper working length and start up. First, the whole string, exclusive of the temper screw, is lowered by the bull wheel till the bit just strikes the bottom. Everything is then taut, with the jaws open to their fullest reach. The rope is then slacked four inches more, and this leaves the jars loose to just that amount. The business-end of the walking beam, with the temper screw depending from it, is next brought down to its lowest position, and the rope is then securely gripped by the clamp of the temper screw. The end of the rope that runs to the bull wheel is slacked off enough to allow free play to the tools. The walking beam has a play of 24 inches. During the first four inches of its ascent it raises the temper screw, the rope, the rope socket, the sinker bar and the upper half of the jars, a weight of 925 pounds and the weight of the rope besides. The momentum of that moving mass is not to be trifled with, and consequently, when the upper half of the jars takes a pull on the lower half, it does so with a jerk or upward blow, sudden enough to loosen or "jar" the bit from its hold in the rock, even if it be pretty badly wedged in, whereas a steady pull would be of little avail.

The walking beam then carries the entire string up the remaining 20 inches. Now, a body falling freely would make that distance of 20 inches in about ⅛ of a second; but the beam is forced down a little faster than that, and hence the upper half of the string gets the start on the lower half and keeps it, so that the bit with its load (1320 pounds) has a free fall of 20 inches, and delivers a clear, sharp, cutting blow. The energy in this case amounts to 2200 foot-pounds, and this, concentrated on the thin edge of a hard steel chisel-bit, will enable the bit to gradually bite its way into the hardest rock. It will be at once evident that the jars are not only an important tool, but the very heart of the drilling set; and it is to Billy Morris that we owe them. We therefore entirely agree with Dr. J. P. Hale, of Charleston, W. Va., who says: "Billy Morris never patented his invention, and never asked for nor made a dollar out of it, but as a public benefactor, he deserves to rank with the inventors of the sewing-machine, reaping-machine, planing-machine, printing-cylinders, cotton-gin," etc. It is this tool which has

rendered deep boring possible, and it has been adopted wherever such work is required to be done.

The use of the temper-screw has not yet been made clear. Well, while that bit is pounding away, the hole is getting deeper, and consequently the "play" of the jars is getting less, so that in a short time the bit would no longer reach the rock, but would content itself, as many Christians do, with good intentions, and merely beat the air. To obviate this, the "borer," by means of a short double-handed lever, keeps backing the screw downwards, according as the bit progresses, and at the same time keeps turning the whole system around from right to left and from left to right, so that the bit may make a round hole, and not be liable to get stuck fast. The temper-screw has a run of four feet, and when it has been worked out to its full stretch the hole in the rock has reached the same depth. The rope may now be let out that amount, and the temper-screw adjusted as at the start; but if the work is on solid rock, it will be time to clean out the pulverized material from the hole; this is done by means of the sand-pump, and then a new start is made for another stretch.

A string of tools, complete, is valued at about $900. By their use, wells have been bored to great depths. Experience has shown that oil may exist at depths separated from each other by perfectly impermeable strata of clay or rock; and often, when a well has apparently been exhausted, a deeper drilling has developed a second, and a still deeper one a third, "horizon" of oil-bearing sand; and we know not but that there may yet be deeper depths to be reached by and by. As far as we are aware, however, up to date, the Watson well, at Titusville, is the most profound, its depth being 3553 feet, or over two-thirds of a mile.

Our history has, perhaps, been getting a trifle too technical, but, undertaking quite innocently to describe a machine, is something like taking hold of an electric-light or trolley-wire—you never know when you are going to let go again.

Getting back to that first boring for brine by the Ruffner brothers, we learn that not only brine, but also a small quantity of petroleum was obtained. In wells bored subsequently, not only there, but in many other places, peiroleum often accompanied the brine in considerable quantities. Except for the little used in medicine, it was considered a great nuisance and allowed to run to waste. For instance, in 1829, the famous "American" well was bored near the bed of the Little Rennox Creek, at Burkesville, Ky. *The Niles' Register* gives an account, of which the substance is as follows: In boring for brine, a vein of pure oil was struck. The oil "gushed" to a height of 30 feet above the ground, and flowed away into the Cumberland river, on which it was traced nearly 100 miles. About two miles below the well, the oil was set on fire by a boy (oh! the boy! but tradition has it that he grew up to be a man, and fought on the right side in the Civil War afterwards), and for 56 miles the river was one mass of seething flame and curling clouds of smoke. Those who witnessed the scene, testified that they had never

before looked on such a sight, and never expected to again—at least in this world. At the beginning this well gave 1000 barrels of oil a day, and for more than thirty years it was still suplying oil plentifully. After a while, the waste was stopped; the oil was bottled up, and "American Medicinal Oil, Burkesville, Kentucky," was known all through this country, and in many parts of Europe. But, as a brine-well, the "American" was not a success. Several other brine-wells had to be abandoned because of too much oil, just as, later on, oil-wells were abandoned because of too much brine, though, paradoxical as it may appear, it is easier to separate brine from oil than to separate oil from brine.

In the early part of the decade, 1850 to 1860, attention was being seriously called to petroleum as an illuminant. The supply of sperm oil was showing signs of falling off, and yet the world was shouting for "light, more light"—but there was an episode worth recalling here. In the difficulty of too little sperm oil, and not enough of anything to replace it, a substance yclept "*Burning Fluid*" was introduced, and made frantic efforts to obtain a permanent footing. To the world of commerce it is dead, buried, and forgotten, long ago, but our recollection is that it was a mixture of three parts of alcohol with one part of turpentine. Turpentine, when burnt alone, gives a horribly smoky flame. This smoke is mainly carbon in a very finely divided state. If the heat of the flame were sufficiently intense, this carbon would first get white-hot, and then pass to the condition of an invisible vapor, and the flame would be luminous without smoke. Now alcohol burns with an intense heat and without smoke, and therefore a proper mixture of the two did give a beautiful white light. But, alas! the luxury proved too dangerous. As a friend of the undertaker, the "deadly trolley" could not begin to compete with it. We could a tale unfold of many accidents, but a single one will suffice to give an insight into the devious ways of the substance, and it is as clear to our recollection as if it happened but yesterday. A grocer, while drawing some of the "liquid gunpowder" into a measuring vessel, accidentally let a "live" cigar stump fall into the fluid. The building was insured for its full value, and the funeral was largely and respectably attended. The stuff was sold under various fancy names, but "Burning Fluid" was the generic term. As far as burning was concerned, it was a brilliant success, but fortunately, if it began like a meteor, it ended like a shooting star. End of the episode, the grocer, and the "fluid."

In the meantime, crude petroleum had been tried as a medicine, and, as we have hinted, with some success; but there was hardly rheumatism enough in the country to warrant exploiting on a large scale. It had also been tried as a lubricating oil, and had given fair promise for the future. It had been tried as a lamp oil, and gave light. The wicks, however, became encrusted with coke, the flame was somewhat smoky, and the odors thereof were a long way from those of Araby the Blest. Something, however, had to be done, and so they set to work in earnest to purify the oil. Chemicals were tried first, and partial success fol-

lowed their use; but it was only after recourse was had to distillation that the "light of the future" became the light of the present, or was at least discernible through the rifts in the coming time.

The demand for petroleum now became so eager, that men literally forgot their salt. It was then that the Pennsylvania Rock Oil Company was incorporated by George H. Bissel and Jonathan Eveleth, December 30, 1854, under the laws of the State of New York. The real estate consisted of 105 acres of land in Venango and Crawford counties, Pa., hard by the lumbering village of Titusville, at the junction of Pine and Oil creeks, a few miles north of the point where the latter empties its greasy waters into the Allegheny river, and where Oil City now stands. This company seems to have contented itself with digging, bailing out, and skimming off, but after a little over two years of this unpoetic work, the property was sold to Ives and Pierpont, of New Haven, and a new organization was effected under the name of the "Seneca Oil Company." They, too, dragged along in the old ruts for another year or more, until at last it dawned upon them that the true source of the oil might be at a greater depth than could be reached by mere digging. They accordingly engaged Mr. E. L. Drake to go out to Titusville and drill an artesian well for oil. Drake arrived on the scene in the spring of 1858, and set to work. His idea at first, seems to have been, to dig down to the rock, and then drill, just as they had done for brine at Kanawha fifty years before. The quicksands and water, however, protested so vigorously that he was obliged to give up that idea. But the "mother of invention" was there, and with her counsel he procured an iron pipe and drove it straight down to the rock, which proved to be at a depth of 36 feet below the surface of the ground. The bore of the pipe was large enough to accommodate the drilling tools, such as, by anticipation, we have already described. The idea of a drive-pipe originated, indeed, with Drake, and it is only second in importance to Billy Morris's Jars. By midsummer, the whole plant was set up, and all in readiness to begin the attack, when it was discovered that the "borers," who had been engaged early in the season, had got tired of waiting, and had secured work elsewhere. It was too late to find others, so nothing remained but to lay over till the next season, when William Smith and his two sons, experienced salt-well borers, were engaged. They arrived in June, but did not get things ready to strike the first blow till the middle of August. They began at last, and in two weeks they had penetrated the rock to a depth of 33 feet, when, just before shutting down on Saturday night, August 28, 1859, the drill struck a crevice into which it fell 6 inches. Smith was dying to know what was going to come of it, and was so saturated with the oil mania, that he made up his mind to brave the scandal and investigate the matter even on the Sabbath day. In extenuation, however, it may be stated that he waited till the afternoon. He then went and dropped a pebble into the pipe, and hearing a splash he knew that the drill-hole was full of liquid to within a few feet of the top. He established communication with that liquid by means of a tin cup on the

end of a string, and found to his joy that it was petroleum. Such is the story of Drake's well, the first well bored, *ex professo,* as we may say, for petroleum. The news that oil which rose, of its own accord, to the surface, had been obtained by boring, spread like wild-fire, and land around Titusville was eagerly bought up.

The daily product of all the wells in June, 1860, was estimated at 200 barrels. By September, 1861, the daily production had reached 700 barrels, and then commenced the flowing-well period, with an addition to the production of 6000 or 7000 barrels a day. The price fell to 20 cents a barrel, then to 15, then to 10. Soon, it was impossible to obtain barrels on any terms, for all the coopers in the surrounding country could not make them as fast as the Empire well could fill them. Small producing wells were forced to cease operations, and scores of operators became disheartened and abandoned their wells. The production during the early part of 1863 was scarcely half that of the beginning of 1862, and that of 1864 was still less. In May, 1865, the production had declined to less than 4000 barrels a day. Commencing at Titusville in 1859, the tide of development swept over the valley of Oil Creek, and along the Allegheny river above and below Oil City for a considerable distance; then Cherry Run, in 1864. Then Pithole creek, Benninghoff and Pioneer run; the Woods and Stevenson farms, on Oil Creek, in like succession, in 1865 and 1866; Tidioute and Triumph Hill in 1867, and in the latter part of the same year came Shamburg. In 1868, the Pleasantville oil-field furnished the chief centre of excitement. So speaks Henry in his "History of Petroleum."

On account of the decline in the production in 1865, and at the same time the increased demand which had sprung up, higher prices obtained, and the immediate result was that wells were bored from Manitoulin Island on the north to Alabama on the south, and from Missouri on the west to New York on the east. Still, out of sixteen States or Territories in which petroleum has been found, only four now yield enough to be of commercial importance. These are Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, and West Virginia, and of these Pennsylvania easily takes the lead. In four, semi-solid petroleum has been found, the two of importance being California and Texas. Solid petroleum has been found in ten, but in California only does it exist in paying quantities. The development of the solid and semi-solid petroleum fields has been comparatively trifling, but the number of wells drilled to obtain liquid petroleum, and the results secured, have been something enormous. This will become apparent, to some extent at least, from the following statements:

The number of wells drilled during a given time has, of course, varied greatly. In some years nearly, if not quite, 4000 wells have been put down, of which about 4 per cent have proved to be mere dry holes. It must not be imagined, however, that the *producing* wells have been increased by that number, for while wells are being drilled at one point, they are being abandoned as exhausted at others. When a "strike" has been made, oil-derricks come in like an army of occupation, and

take possession of the land. Every other interest then has to give way, and the once lovely face of nature is draped in desolation. Afterwards, when the wells have been so far exhausted as to cease to be profiable, the boring "rigs" are transported to pastures new, or are left to rot where they stand. The motley army moves on; the wave of desolation passes; husbandry resumes its sway, and nature gradually and patiently repairs the ruin her children have wrought. So it has always been, and so it will always probably be till the day when the earth has given up her last barrel of treasured oil. How near, or how far away, that day may be no mortal can tell.

The total shipment of oil in 1857 was made to a firm in Brooklyn, N. Y. It amounted to 505½ gallons of crude oil, and was valued at 70 cents a gallon; but the price soon rose to $2.00 a gallon, and then came Oil creek, and all that came in its train.

Table Showing the Yearly Production, Average Price, and Total Value of Oil for the Years indicated.

Year.	Number of Barrels.	Average price per barrel.	Value.
1859	2,000	$20 00	$40,000 00
1860	500,000	9 60	4,800,000 00
1861	2,113,609	49	1,035,668 41
1862	3,056,690	1 05	3,209,524 50
1863	2,611,309	3 15	8,225,623 35
1864	2,116,109	9 87½	20,896,576 37
1865	2,497,700	6 59	16,459,843 00
1866	3,597,700	3 74	13,455,398 00
1867	3,347,300	2 41	8,066,993 00
1868	3,646,117	3 62½	13,217,174 12
1869	4,215,000	5 63	23,730,450 00
1870	5,260,745	3 89¾	20,503,753 63
1871	5,205,341	4 34	22,591,179 94
1872	5,890,248	3 64	21,770,502 72
1873	9,890,964	1 83	18,100,464 12
1874	10,809,852	1 17	12,647,526 84
1875	8,787,506	1 35	11,863,133 10
1876	8,968,906	2 56¼	22,982,821 62
1877	13,135,771	2 42	31,788,565 82
1878	15,163,462	1 19	18,044,519 78
1879	20,041,581	85⅞	17,210,707 68
1880	26,032,421	94½	24,600,637 84
Total, . . .	156,890,331	2 13½	$334,911,063 84
1881 to 1890	392,000,000	68	266,500,000 00
1891	54,291,980	55	29,860,598 00
1892	50,509,136	51⅓	25,901,436 00
1893	48,412,666	59¾	28,932,326 00
Grand Total,	702,104,113	97¾	$686,105,428 84

Strictly, speaking, all these figures are for Pennsylvania and the small oil field of New York lying adjacent thereto; but they may be considered sufficiently exact for our purpose, since the output of all the rest

of the country certainly does not exceed one per cent. of the whole. The numbers given for the decade 1881 to 1890, are merely estimates, as the official figures were not at hand; all the other figures are from official statistics. The values given are for the crude oil, just as it is sold in bulk; but it is clear that oil refined for illuminating, lubricating, not to mention medicinal and other purposes, must be worth much more. Thus, a barrel of crude oil was worth in 1893, 59¾ cents, while the average cost of refined oils, of all kinds, was about $2.10, or over three and a half times as much. If we figure on this basis, we shall find that the amount added to the wealth of the country by the development of the petroleum industry, in thirty-five years, will reach, in round numbers, the magnificent sum of two and a half billions of dollars, and this without taking account of petroleum in the solid, semi-solid, and gaseous forms. If this liquid petroleum were all stored in barrels, and the barrels placed end to end, they would make a line long enough to reach around the earth fifteen times.

Finally, we give another short table which, we doubt not, will be of interest. It is taken from Joseph D. Weeks' "Report on Petroleum," for 1893.

The World's Production of Petroleum.

Countries.	Production in Barrels.
United States (1893),	48,412,666
Russia, Baku (1893),	33,104,126
Russia, elsewhere (1890),	251,543
Austria-Hungary (1890),	816,000
Canada (1893),	798,406
Peru (1890),	350,000
India (1891),	146,107
Germany (1892)	103,323
France (1891),	70,000
Japan (1890),	48,027
Argentina (1891),	21,000
Italy (1891),	8,085
Great Britain (1892),	1,526
Other countries (estimated),	200,000
Total,	84,330,809

From this table we learn that the United States supplies about 57½ per cent. of the world's petroleum, and Russia 39½ per cent., leaving just 3 per cent. to be accounted for by all the small fry together, of which Great Britain is the smallest, her contribution being less than one five-hundredth of one per cent.

For much of the information given in this article we acknowledge our indebtedness to S. F. Peckham's "Report on Petroleum," in the United States Tenth Census; and also to Dr. William Brannt's recent work on the same subject, which, barring the little slip mentioned above, is worthy of all commendation.

T. J. A. Freeman, S. J.

Book Notices.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES COMPARED IN CIVILIZATION, POPULAR HAPPINESS, GENERAL INTELLIGENCE AND MORALITY. By *Alfred Young*, Priest of the Congregation of St. Paul the Apostle.

"The chief object of this book," says its author, "is to examine into the truth or falsehood of the grave popular accusations laid against the Catholic Church, her priesthood and people; and also to test the value of the evidence offered in support of the boastful claims one so often hears made for the alleged superior intellectual character and moral influence of Protestantism and modern secularism."

The book is a plain, well-written, truthful statement of the question at issue. Father Young gives facts and figures. His facts are chiefly from Protestant authors, and his figures are from official statistics. The value of the book can hardly be overrated, if we bear in mind the almost total ignorance of the non-Catholic American, not only of the Catholic Church and her doctrines, but of the principles of divine revelation.

Father Young cites the Rev. Dr. Washington Gladden in the *Century Magazine* for March, 1894, who says of the ready credence given to the vile calumnies published against Catholics that "the depth and density of that popular ignorance which permits the use of such documents is certainly appalling."

If a respectable Protestant minister, thoroughly American and patriotic, is forced to cry out against the appalling "depth and density" of the ignorance of his Protestant fellow-citizens concerning us, and this on vital questions—questions that affect the honor and character and patriotism of Catholics, the case must be bad indeed.

What the Rev Dr. Gladden says to-day, Rev. Leonard Bacon, a director of "The American and Foreign Christian Union," said years ago. "The series of books issued by the Society are," he says, "infamous and scandalous rubbish." And Putnam's Magazine, in which the reverend director condemned this unchristian conduct of the said Protestant society, denounced the publications as "wicked impostures and shameful scandals." Did the writers of the Christian Union recall and destroy these infamous books, these vile impostures, these shameful scandals? Father Young tells us that instead of destroying them they denounced Dr. Bacon and demanded his expulsion from the Society.

A book that furnishes an array of facts of this sad nature—facts written and deplored by fair-minded Protestants, is surely a valuable contribution to the literature of to-day. There is no doubt that the erroneous notions of our religion entertained by non-Catholics are the direct outcome of their "appalling ignorance" of the first principles of Christianity.

It is our duty to strive to remedy this very great evil. Father Young has done much. Let all Catholics help the good work by circulating this very timely book.

"A nation," he says, "is the more civilized in which the equality of human nature is the more emphatically recognized, and in which the inalienable rights of man to life, liberty and the pursuit of true happiness are more securely defended."

The recognition of the equality of our common nature brings out the simple, sublime truth that God is the beginning and the end of all things; that He has created us; that by His overruling providence He governs the universe, and that His law is the only standard of moral excellence. The man who realizes this fact and makes the divine law his rule of life, whether he be rich or poor, has the elements of civilization in him, and a nation made up of such men would not be far from true civilization.

That civilization, on the other hand, which consists in colossal fortunes, great material progress, in extensive railroads and great waterways; which beatifies the rich man and looks upon the poor man as wretched, and his poverty, if not a crime, at least as a something so abhorrent to the sensibilities of the cultured that it must be hurried out of sight, is not true civilization.

Mere material progress effaces all noble ideals of conduct, making success the sole end of life. It either ignores God or questions His right of dominion or interference in this world, saying: "Who is the Lord that I should serve Him?"

This pagan civilization makes might right, brutalizes man and prepares him to prey upon the society that has robbed him by a false education of his real status in life.

This, Father Young shows clearly. He proves his position by setting before us the state of society to-day in England. He very properly selects England as the foremost and wealthiest of the Protestant countries. England governs or misgoverns more than one-fourth of the population of the world. Her territories are found on both continents, her ships on every sea. She is the world's great banking-house. Her missionaries, protected by her arms, are met in every land. Church and State are united. Her bishops are lords of the realm and her clergy gentlemen of the highest culture. And yet her own people, the people of England, English men and English women, are the most degraded on the face of the earth.

This is, indeed, a bold statement; but hear Father Young on the subject and examine his proofs:

"There is no nation on the face of the earth of which equal evidence could be furnished of its people's degradation, brutal slavery, appalling immorality, and unparalleled pauperism, as has been written concerning England by Englishmen themselves, to say nothing of other testimonies. Who are enlightened in England? A very few, compared with the great mass of the people. The peasantry, the laborers, the miners, the factory operatives, the millions who deserve the name of 'the people'—these are simply wretched barbarians."

Father Young cites Mr. Charles Edward Lester, a Protestant, in his "Glory and Shame of England," as follows: "The ignorance, vice, disease, deformity, and wretchedness of the English operatives as a body almost exceed belief. I am persuaded the physical miseries of the English operatives are greater by far than the *West India slaves suffered before their emancipation.* They are too ignorant to understand their rights, and too weak to assert them."

The poet Southey says: "We talk of the liberty of the English, and they talk of their own liberty; but *there is no liberty in England for the poor.* They are no longer sold with the soil it is true; but they cannot quit the soil if there be any probability or suspicion that age or infirmity may disable them. If, in such a case, they endeavor to remove to some situation where they hope more easily to maintain themselves, the overseers are alarmed; the intruder is apprehended as if he were a criminal,

and sent back to his own parish. Wherever a pauper dies, that parish must bear the cost of his funeral; instances, therefore, have not been wanting of wretches in the last stage of disease having been hurried away in an open cart upon straw, and dying upon the road. Nay, even women in the very pains of labor have been driven out, and have perished by the wayside, because the birthplace of the child would be its parish."

Is it necessary to go further?

Mr. Joseph Kay, in his startling work, "The Social Condition and Education of the English People," whose work was the result of his observations as a commissioner appointed by the University of Cambridge to examine and report on the social condition of the poor in various countries, says that nothing in all the world could be compared with the horrible condition of England. The Statistical Society of London was so astounded at the revelations of Mr. Kay, that it appointed a committee to investigate the truth of his report. This committee says: "The picture in detail of human wretchedness, filth, and brutal degradation, the chief features of which are a disgrace to a civilized country, ... your committee finds to be too true." It goes on to say: "Out of 1954 families visited, 551, containing a population of 2025 persons, have only one room each; 562 families, containing a population of 2554 persons, have only two rooms each." These conditions of life are not to be found in any other country.

Mr. Chamberlain, M. P., writes in the *Fortnightly Review*: "Never before in our history were wealth and the evidences of wealth more abundant; never before was luxurious living so general and so wanton in its display, and never before was the misery of the poor more intense, or the condition of their daily life more hopeless or more degraded. We have a million of paupers, and millions more on the verge of pauperism."

Mr. Conybeare, speaking of infidelity, says: "It is a melancholy fact that the men who make our steam engines and railway carriages, our presses and telegraphs, the furniture of our houses, and the clothing of our persons, have now, in a fearful proportion, renounced all faith in Christianity."

Can we speak of what John Ruskin, in his "Fors Clavigera," calls "Hell pits, where little boys and girls not only worked like brutes, but were beaten with horrible cruelty as they crawled on their hands and knees harnessed to coal carts?"

But it is scarcely possible to write more. The condition of these poor people is too horrible and harrowing to describe. And this in Christian England! And this state of affairs is known to the Christian men and Christian women who send missionaries to convert the far off heathen! The Queen, the Lords, and the Commons, the Commissions and the Committees, are all aware of it, and what is done to effect a remedy? We say with regret, scarcely anything.

Hear the Protestant Bishop of Rochester: "I lament that dense, and coarse, and almost brutal ignorance, in which the toiling masses of the people who have outgrown the Church's grasp, are permitted to live and die, of all that touches their salvation, and explains their destiny." To what must we attribute this gloomy and terrible condition of the English masses? To the utter failure of Protestantism, and to that heartless indifference which is its logical outcome.

Contrast England with Spain. Spain, one of the poorest countries in Europe. The peasantry are gentle in their manners, moral in their relations, free from that coarseness and brutality that is so painfully evidenced in our picture of the English.

Hear Mr. Thieblin: "In the lowest classes you see almost the same merits as you meet with in the highest circles. The wife of a peasant is just as loving to her husband, just as careful about her children, and just as kind to everybody surrounding her as the wife of a grandee. She is, perhaps, even more so. Whether you knock at the door of an inn or of an isolated farm, all the women of the house come to receive you, and nothing will be refused you. If you fall ill, whether it be at a hotel, a lodging-house, or the residence of a friend, you may be perfectly sure of having such kindness and attention as you could scarcely find in your own home." ("Spain and the Spaniards," by Thieblin.)

We could go on multiplying quotations in commendation of the simple and happy lives of the peasantry of Spain. No coarseness, no brutality, no startling immorality; but a people who, though not wealthy, realize that they are the children of God, and endeavor to lead lives worthy of their sublime destiny.

We have reviewed but two chapters of this admirable work. It would require a lengthy article to do anything like justice to its merits, or to convey anything like an adequate idea of the unquestionable testimonies of the superiority of Catholic countries to Protestant countries in gentleness of manners, in social happiness, and in the morality of the poor.

BROTHER JUSTIN.

PATROLOGIA SYRIACA. accurante *R. Graffin.* Pars Prima, ab initiis usque ad annum 350. Tomus primus. Parisiis: Firmin-Didot et Socii.

It is the peculiarity of Syriac literature to be almost exclusively sacred, so that the term *Patrologia Syriaca* is nearly synonymous with Syriac literary activity. This language also possesses the perennial charm of being the native tongue of Our Blessed Lord and of His Immaculate Mother, as preserving the identical terms in which Gabriel saluted Mary, St. Peter, the Son of the Living God, and Christ His chosen Vicar. It was, moreover, chiefly among the Syrians that the storms raised by Nestorius and Eutyches exercised their most pernicious influence. No Catholic theologian, therefore, can afford to ignore this department of sacred learning. The rudiments of the Syriac, the easiest of the Oriental languages, ought to be imparted in all our theological seminaries; and even those who cannot follow the original text can derive profit from reading the careful Latin translations which usually accompany it.

We take great pleasure, therefore, in introducing to our readers the new edition of the Syriac fathers which is now begun by the famous publishing house of Firmin-Didot, under the competent direction of Graffin, Professor of Syriac in the Catholic University of Paris. Like all the works issuing from the press of Firmin-Didot, the volume before is a perfect model of the typographer's art.

The first tome contains the first twenty-two *Demonstrationes* of Aphraates, the most ancient Syrian father whose works have come down to us. The twenty-third, *Demonstratio De Acino*, being written at a later period, is not included with the others. This to us, at first sight, seems to be a mistake. The task of editing this author was committed to Father Pavisot, O S.B., who has prefixed a valuable preliminary treatise.

Mention was made of these *Demonstrationes* in the fifth century by Gennadius, who, however, ascribes them to James of Nisibis, the firm asserter of orthodoxy in the age of the Nicene Council. The misunderstanding arose from the fact that Aphraates, either at his conversion or on being elevated to the episcopate, took the name of Jacob, and was commonly known by the appellation of Mar Jacob. Fourteen of these dissertations were given to the world by Cardinal Antonelli in 1756, in a Latin translation from an Armenian version found in Venice. It

was not until the present century that the original Syriac text was discovered among the Nitrian codices of the British Museum; and finally, in 1869, the learned Wm. Wright published it under the title, "The Homilies of Aphraates, the Persian Sage, edited from Syriac manuscripts of the fifth and sixth century in the British Museum." Thus the most ancient of the Syrian doctors was reintroduced to the learned world.

From (sometimes slender) indications we gather that Aphraates was born of heathen parents somewhere in the Persian Empire; that he lived during the reign of Sapor; that, before his episcopate, he was a monk of the monastery of St. Matthew; that the period of his literary activity extended from 336 to 345. He was, therefore, somewhat younger than St. James of Nisibis, and older than St. Ephraem. The dissertations which he has left us have been variously styled "Homilies," "Letters," "Chapters," "Memoirs," "Histories," etc. The first twenty-two are arranged and named after the letters of the Syriac alphabet; the twenty-third is of the nature of a chronicle. The main purpose of the author seems to be to assert the divinity of the Christian religion, chiefly against the Jews; but he intermingles so much varied moral, historical, and dogmatic information, that he becomes a witness to the faith of the Church in Nicene times that cannot be too highly prized.

It is remarkable that Aphraates, living as he did at a time when Arianism was rampant and, at times, almost triumphant, does not make a single mention either of the heresy or the tumults it caused. This shows how feeble an echo the great contention raised across the Euphrates. The persecuting spirit of Sapor is his chief concern, and the heresies which he sets about confuting are Gnosticism and that monstrosity to which Persia gave birth—Manicheeism.

As to the doctrines which he holds, the following points are worthy of notice, as showing his genuine Catholic spirit. He has in supreme veneration the Sacred Scriptures, as inspired by God and dictated by the Holy Ghost. He holds those books for sacred "which are recited in the Church of God." It is to be regretted that he has nowhere had occasion to give the list of the Sacred Books; but so deeply is he versed in the word of God that he has incidentally quoted from nearly all of them. His citations agree, in the main, with the Peshitta Version, but with variations which induce the editor to believe that he quoted from an older recension than that which is now in use, and that our Syriac Bible might be in places revised according to the text of Aphraates. As to the interpretation of Scripture, the "Persian Sage" is a firm believer in the doctrine of more than one meaning, and he compares the Sacred Text to a precious gem which can be appreciated properly only when viewed from all sides. He insists, however, that the Scriptures are not open to the arbitrary interpretations of each individual, but that, "even as the coin of the realm must bear the effigy of the king," so must the genuine sense be sought in the writings and traditions of the ancients. Time and again he asserts the authority of the Church and of tradition in the interpretation of Holy Writ and the establishing of true doctrine.

The teachings of this ancient and far-away writer on the great Christian tenets are thoroughly Catholic and orthodox. Not only does he give an accurate exposition of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, but, moreover, of the efficacy and necessity of grace; of original sin and the hereditary curse contracted from Adam and removed by Baptism. He has a Syrian's love for Mary, lauds her virginity, her divine motherhood, and her excelling virtues. He knows that the Church has been

founded upon the Rock, and proclaims St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles.

He is equally orthodox respecting the Sacraments. Baptism is the "true circumcision," the "sign of life"; by it "sins are washed away." It is to be conferred by an express invocation of the Three Divine Persons.

He confesses the Eucharist to be the Body and Blood of Christ, Who at the last supper gave to the Apostles His own Body and Blood. The Eucharist, he teaches, is the sacrifice foretold by Malachias.

Not less clearly does he insist on Penance and the Confession of Sins, to which subject he devotes the whole of Demonstration VII. It is the office, he tells us, of the physicians of the soul, the priests, to heal the wounds of him who has been injured in the battle of life, provided the wounded man expose his wound and cry "Peccavi." Let the sinner not shrink from confessing his sins and imploring penance. The spiritual physician should admonish and give healing remedies; on no account should he divulge the fault revealed.

He likewise refers more or less openly to all the other sacraments, except matrimony, which did not happen to come within his range of view.

Every one can see how valuable, from a controversial point of view, are the testimonies to Catholic truth, scattered through the interesting pages of this out-of-the-way "Persian Sage."

One peculiar notion, which Aphraates certainly did not draw from the doctrine of the Church, would have involved him in a sea of trouble, had he lived in the stormy days of John XXII. He held that the souls of the deceased are somehow tied up in a comatose condition with their bodies, and will not be relieved from this embarrassing situation until the day of judgment.

It was, to be sure, an extremely odd notion, which shows how poorly developed were the metaphysical powers of the writer; but there is all the difference in the world beween a crude error and a formal heresy. To a man of Aphraates' humility and devotion to the Church, heresy would have been impossible, and it is safe to say that, were he now living, he would join with us in wondering how any one could have fallen into this grotesque error.

We are thankful, therefore, to the Catholic University of Paris for this great undertaking, to the editor for the ability with which he has addressed himself to the work, and to the distinguished publishers for the magnificence with which they have clothed it.

JOHN BAPTIST FRANZELIN, S.J., Cardinal Priest of the Title SS. Boniface and Alexius. By the *Rev. Nicholas Walsh, S.J.* M. H. Gill & Son: Dublin. 1895.

This neat volume is dedicated to the English-speaking novices and scholastics of the Society of Jesus, and to the English-speaking scholars of Cardinal Franzelin. The author has kept this two-fold object before him throughout his work, first, of holding up the great cardinal as a model of humble sanctity and boundless erudition combined, and secondly, of adding pleasant reminiscences of the days when he sat at the feet of his venerated teacher. The first object he has sought to obtain by inserting at intervals little sermons on various topics suggested by the life which he is reviewing; and although the author seeks to disarm criticism by pleading inexperience, we are compelled to say that the pure, unvarnished tale of the saintly Franzelin's life is a better incentive to novices to join study with prayer than these perpetual and somewhat vexatious

interruptions. The novices will, of course, be forced to make the best of it, as the book will be adopted, and rightly, for their spiritual reading. Others will skip page after page.

Nevertheless, there are pages enough, outside the sermons, to make this a charming little work. The author's enthusiasm for the great man with whom it was his good fortune to be in close contact, is really contagious, and many a priest whose acquaintance with the first Jesuit theologian of the age has been confined to the printed volumes of his grand and exhaustive treatises will be extremely grateful to Father Walsh for the insight now afforded them into his daily life.

Franzelin was born of poor but deeply religious parents at a village near Trent in sturdy Catholic Tyrol on the 13th of April, 1816. His early education was under the direction of the Franciscan fathers in the neighboring town of Bolzano. From the first, the youth was distinguished as well for profound piety as for his intellectual gifts. He became a thorough master of the classical and biblical languages, and to his latest day the Hebrew Bible was his constant and favorite companion. In his eighteenth year he entered the novitiate of the Jesuits at Gratz in Styria, and "outshone all by his rare example." His unintermittent studies and severe austerities undermined his delicate constitution and brought on obstinate chest-troubles and blood-spitting with which he was ever afterward troubled. Having completed his novitiate, he was employed for six years in Gallicia teaching languages; after which, his superiors sent him to the Roman College, the great Jesuit institution on which Bellarmine, Suarez, Lugo, Maldonatus, Vasquez, and a host of other illustrious professors had conferred unparalleled glory. Here young Franzelin had not yet finished his theological studies under the able direction of Perrone and Passaglia, when the troubles of 1848 dispersed the Society so that, with Passaglia and others, he took refuge for a time in England. In 1850, Franzelin, now ordained, returned to Rome and was placed upon the staff of teachers in the Roman College. In 1857 he was named to succeed Father Perrone in the Chair of Dogmatic Theology in the college, a position which he held for nineteen years. It was during this period that he delivered those immortal lectures which, afterwards published in book form, have become the valued possession of the entire Church, and are nowise inferior to the best productions of the greatest theologians of former days. He seemed to have not only the Scriptures and the Fathers but the Scholastics also at his fingers' ends. No one has ever surpassed him in ability of marshalling his vast erudition, in acuteness of analysis, or clearness of exposition. After finishing any of his great theological treatises, one feels that there remains little or nothing to be learned elsewhere upon the subject. Another characteristic of his writings, and it was still more characteristic of his spoken word, is the intenseness of religious feeling which pervades them. "At times," says his biographer, "when lecturing on the Blessed Sacrament, its effects in the souls of men, the teaching of the Church on devotion to the Sacred Heart, the Immaculate Conception and perpetual Virginity of the Mother of God, the tender piety of his soul flashed out despite himself and touched others. I say despite himself, for in the chair he was a theologian and nothing else, nor did he ever go out of his way to introduce mere spiritual or pious allusions. It was again and again remarked by his scholars, that he not only satisfied their intellects, but often moved their hearts."[1] It is this peculiar unction of Cardinal Franzelin's works, as likewise of Cardinal Newman's,

[1] p. 109.

which makes them the best possible models, when popularized, of pulpit oratory. Our age demands this intimate fusion of solid dogmatic truth with genuine unaffected piety.

It was only very gradually and reluctantly that Father Franzelin from a professor became an author. For the convenience of his scholars he began to lithograph his lectures. In 1868 was published the first of his great treatises, "Divine Tradition and Scripture," which, in the estimation of many, is the most perfect and valuable of all his works. Then slowly followed volume after volume until his death, each treatise being eagerly and thankfully greeted by the whole learned Catholic world.

Father Walsh does not expend much space upon the literary labors of Franzelin, taking for granted that all are familiar with his books, and preferring to follow his hero into the quiet routine of his daily life. Indeed, we cannot wonder that the spectacle of such profound humility in the midst of such great intellectual gifts should have made a lasting impression upon those who were brought into contact with it. It was not surprising that Pius IX. should have wished to raise the illustrious theologian to the dignity of the cardinalate; but it was truly edifying to behold the great man when, unable to shirk the undesired promotion, finding some relief in an agony of tears. It was also a continual object-lesson in humility and piety to observe how little the new dignity changed the character and manners of the good religious. "The only signs of his dignity," says one who visited him, "were the red berrettino or skull-cap, which is *de rigeur*, and a very poor-looking ring. He had two rather small rooms, in one of which he studied, took his meals and slept; and into the other he went only to receive visitors. He got rid of carpets which had been laid down, but allowed them to be replaced by some cheap, rough matting. Through the whole year, winter and summer, he rose at 4 o'clock; at 5.30, immediately after his meditation, he went to his confessor, and for the last two years of his life he did so every morning; nor would he ever allow, though pressed to do so, his confessor to come to him, nor go to confession before others, even the youngest student, if he found him on the corridor awaiting his turn." Certainly, this spectacle of a prince of Holy Church awaiting his turn among students to make his daily confession, would be an admirable subject for the pencil, and is more impressive than a score of sermons. Thus did Cardinal Franzelin pass the eleven closing years of his life, during which he was engaged upon the most important and difficult matters of ecclesiastical administration. The end came placidly on the early morning of December 11, 1886.

Franzelin's was a life full worthy of being put on record, and the task has fallen to one who was well equipped with an intimate knowledge of his subject and that first requisite in a biographer, an intense personal admiration for a great and holy man.

Ludovici De San, S.J., in Collegio maximo Lovaniensi, S.J., Professoris, Academiæ Romanæ S. Thomæ Aq. Socii, Tractatus de Deo Uno. Pars Prior præter tres partes prioris ipsius tractatus continens disquisitionem de mente Sancti Thomæ circa Prædeterminationes Physicas. Lovanii excedebat Carolus Peeters. 1894. From Benziger Brothers: 36–38 Barclay St., New York.

We had hoped before noticing this volume to have read it with something of the care and attention its importance demands, but regret that, so far, we have been unable to secure the requisite leisure. We have, however, examined it sufficiently to be able to testify to its great value and clearness. A volume, indeed, of 778 pages, large octavo, devoted

to a portion of a simple tract (on the Being and Attributes of God) is of itself sufficient to indicate the thoroughness which characterizes the work. This fullness of treatment without prolixity makes it comparatively easy reading, and gives a clearness and intelligibility that can hardly be hoped for in any mere compendium.

What will particularly interest most readers will undoubtedly be the "disquisition" on the teaching and "mind" of St. Thomas "circa predeterminationes physicas," that is, on the question whether in all those acts which the divine goodness and assistance enables man to perform in the work of his salvation, the human will is not only aided but predetermined by divine grace. The Catholic Church, as is well known, maintains the necessity of divine grace to enable a man to believe, hope, love or repent as he ought; it teaches, in short, that no one can elicit any act or do anything whatever in the order of salvation without the prompting and assistance of the Divine Spirit, but it no less strongly affirms man's responsibility and freedom in accepting and acting under this gracious influence. "If any one saith, that man's free will moved and excited by God, by assenting to God exciting and calling, nowise co-operates towards disposing and preparing itself for obtaining the grace of justification; that it cannot refuse its consent, if it would, but that, as something inanimate, it does nothing whatever and is merely passive; let him be anathema."—Council of Trent, Sess. VI., Can. 4. Accordingly, Catholic theologians of all schools in opposition to Calvin and his followers, hold, and are bound to hold, that the human will remains free even under the influence of what is called efficacious grace; that is, of all grace which a man accepts and co-operates with, or which, in fact, produces the effect for which it was given. A certain school, however, which claims to be specially Thomistic, agrees with Calvin in asserting that efficacious grace is such intrinsically and of its own nature and predetermines the human will, but differs from him by denying that it follows from this that the will does not remain free. Catholic theologians of other schools find fault, not so much with Calvin's logic as with his premise; they maintain that efficacious grace aids indeed and strengthens the will but does not predetermine it, and compare such grace rather to a most powerful and efficacious medicine, which will infallibly produce its effect if accepted and used by the patient, but otherwise not. In the modern use of the term (efficacious grace) this acceptance and consent on the part of the will is presupposed; that is, a grace is not said to be efficacious unless actually accepted and fruitful; thus the will is, indeed, already determined, but determined, it is contended, by its own free act, prompted and aided by grace, and not by grace alone.

For their peculiar views, the predeterminationists claim especially the authority of St. Thomas; in a similar manner Calvinists have always claimed the authority of St. Augustine. There are, no doubt, in both St. Thomas and St. Augustine phrases and passages that would seem to justify the respective claims; but it is a question of interpretation or exegesis; and just as Holy Scripture admits sometimes of different and even contradictory interpretations, so do the writings of the Fathers and scholastics. What has ever appeared more clearly and thoroughly Calvinistic, at least to Calvinists, than that passage of St. Augustine where he says: "Subventum est igitur infirmitati voluntatis humanae, ut divina gratia indeclinabiliter et insuperabiliter[1] ageretur." "There-

[1] We take insuperabiliter, not inseperabiliter, to be undoubtedly the correct reading.

fore aid was brought[1] to the infirmity of human will, so that it might be unchangeably and invincibly influenced by divine grace."—Dr. Wallis, Edinburgh translation. The word "ageretur," here translated influenced, has, we think, been generally understood by Protestants to mean "acted upon"; but "agi," in such a connection, does not mean "to be acted upon" or "influenced," but "to be moved to action," "*to be led*," "to march," "to go" (for proofs, see, for example, Harper's "Dictionary," under "ago."—B.), and the meaning of the passage quoted is that "the weakness of the human will has been aided, so as to be led unflinchingly[2] and insuperably by divine grace." The point inculcated is, not that grace is invincible against the human will, but that the human will, led and strengthened by grace, is invincible against temptation. This, besides being clear in itself, is borne out by the "subventum est," "aided," and by the rest of the sentence: "et ideo, quamvis infirma, non tamen deficeret, neque adversitate aliqua vinceretur"; "and therefore, although weak, yet it should not fail nor be overcome by any opposition."

We have given this as a specimen to show how easy it is for even learned and able men to mistake and consequently to misrepresent the meaning and drift of an author, unless they are thoroughly acquainted with and pay strict attention to the exact force of the language he uses. St. Augustine clearly has been much misunderstood by those who claim, no doubt sincerely, to be his special disciples, and so, we believe, has St. Thomas. Were it otherwise, and were the Calvinistic interpretation of St. Augustine and the predeterminationist representation of St. Thomas in reality correct, we should have to say of these great saints and profound thinkers, "humani aliquid passi sunt." But, happily, we have no need of recurring to such an hypothesis; a true understanding of these saints' real teaching, we are persuaded, no less than a regard for their honor, forbid us to entertain it. For the proof of this as regards St. Thomas, and for a thorough examination and exposition of his "mind" and writings on the subject, we take pleasure in referring our readers to Fr. De San's able "Disquisition," which occupies more than 200 pages of the volume before us.

The price is $3.10 net, but Messrs. Benziger request us to state that the second volume (which will complete the work) will be furnished gratuitously to purchasers of the first.

THINGS OF THE MIND. By *J. L. Spalding*, Bishop of Peoria. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1894.

Bishop Spalding's latest book appears with this very general title which does not tell us much of its contents. We open the volume and find that it contains seven chapters, with these headings: 1. Views of Education; 2. Views of Education; 3. Views of Education; 4. Professional Education; 5. Theories of Life and Education; 6. Culture and Religion; 7. Patriotism. These titles are also very general, particularly the first four, and we turn over a page to read the preface, in which, no doubt, the author will tell us something about the history of the book: when he wrote it, or its different chapters; what particular occasions called them forth; the connection of one chapter with another, and why they now appear together. Then we shall read the introduction, in which the author will tell us how he is going to treat this subject,

---

[1] "*Is* brought," Amer. ed.

[2] "Indeclinabiliter" means "unflinchingly" rather than "unchangeably."

and by placing before us an outline of the whole work, he will enable us more easily to understand the meaning of each part.

But there is no preface or introduction. We are sorry, because these few preliminary pages excite our interest at once by introducing us to the author, and by bringing us into sympathy with his methods and purposes.

We turn now to the matter of the chapters. The book is not a connected treatise on education, nor on any particular part of it, but it is made up of essays or addresses written apparently at different times and for different occasions. We do not know the times or the occasions which gave rise to them, except in two instances. The chapter entitled, "Professional Education" contains an address made to a graduating class of some medical school in Kentucky, and the chapter on "Theories of Life and Education" reproduces a paper with the same title which appeared in the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW of January, 1879.

Most of these essays will hardly interest the general reader. They are made up for the most part of epigrammatic sentences and quotations from the Greek, the Latin and the English classics, which follow one another very rapidly. The general reader does not jump to conclusions, he creeps to them, nor is he willing to be carried to them instead of being led. It is evident that the cultured author has written only for the *literati*, a class which (we say it with unfeigned regret) is growing evanescent in this busy age and country, where very few have the leisure or acquired taste of appreciating pure literature for its own sweet sake. The majority of us demand books that are brimful of facts and practical ideas. But there is room and a public for all sorts of books and styles.

ST. CHANTAL AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE VISITATION. By *Monseigneur Bougard*, Bishop of Laval. Translated from the eleventh French edition by a Visitandine. 2 vols., 8vo. Benziger Brothers, New York, 1895.

The first edition of this work was published in 1861; the second, revised by the gifted author, appeared two years later; and the translation before us is made from the eleventh. This is a great book. It is the life of a great saint, made by a great biographer, from exceptionally good documents.

Jeanne-Françoise Frémyot was born at Dijon, the capital of Burgundy, and the native place of St. Bernard and Bossuet, in the year 1572. Her mother died when she was eighteen months old. At the age of twenty she married Baron de Chantal, and after eight years of happy married life, during which she bore six children, she was left a widow by the sudden death of her husband. She immediately made a vow of chastity and began to devote herself to works of piety and charity. After much trouble of conscience in choosing a director, in 1604 she met St. Francis de Sales and placed herself under his guidance. The description of their first meeting and the record of their communications for eighteen years until he died in 1622, charms the reader, and surrounds him with the odor of sanctity in which these two holy souls dwelt.

After the death of St. Francis, St Vincent de Paul became her director and guide for twenty years, until she died in 1641. She was canonized in 1751. For eighteen years this saint was directed by St. Francis de Sales, and for twenty years St. Vincent de Paul was her spiritual father. The first said of her: "I have found in Dijon, what Solomon could

not find in Jerusalem, the *strong woman*, in Madame de Chantal." St. Vincent de Paul surpassed the holy Bishop of Geneva in his praises of her. If his moderation were not so well known, he might be accused of exaggeration when he says that during the twenty years she was under his spiritual direction, he never observed in her the least imperfection. His judgment of her was confirmed immediately after her death, when in a vision he saw her soul joined to that of St. Francis de Sales, and both united to God.

The learned and pious Bishop Dupanloup said of her when reviewing this biography in 1863:

"Here is a saint who lived almost in our own day, ... and yet where can we find, even in the flush of the Middle Ages, even in the earliest centuries, distinction more elevated, dignity better sustained, heroism more pathetic?

"As a child, she was pious, modest, innocent. Her energetic and Christian sentiments find a parallel only in the lives of the greatest saints.

"In early womanhood, her courage increased with the duties devolving on her. She was, in turn, a wife, a mother, the mistress of a household, a woman of the world, though never ceasing to be a saint. Whether amid the delight and spendor of a brilliant position, or struggling against the cruel trials of life, from which neither titles nor worldly affluence can shield, she displayed all that magnanimity of soul of which a Christian woman is capable. Widowed by a sudden and sorrowful accident; living in retirement with her four little ones, whom she reared with the poor whom she loved, we behold her advancing to the highest perfection, courageously rising under the greatest saint of her age, to heroism and sacrifice unsurpassed.

"Lastly, a religious and the foundress of an order, she united to a life the most recollected, to a life wholly contemplative, the most solid and fruitful activity. She founded eighty houses of the Visitation, reformed a number of abbeys and monasteries, filled the world with her letters, her works, and the perfume of her virtues—and all this without for one moment losing sight of her children whom she directed, and whom with incomparable affection, she incited to the fulfillment of their duties, both before and after marriage."

Bishop Dupanloup read this life twice—the second time, as he says himself, "with pencil in hand." After speaking of all the requisites for a good biography of a saint, and necessary qualifications for a good biographer; and after mentioning all the great biographies that had come under his attention, he writes to the author of this work:

"Your St. Chantal, my dear friend, is destined to rank among the finest of these books. If the end of your labor has been the glory of God, the honor of Holy Church, the advantage to be derived by those to whom you familiarize so great a soul as the foundress of the Visitation, you may entertain the sweet hope that you have attained the end in view."

The translation is so well done that it preserves completely the beauty of the original. The spirit of the author breathes in the translator. Indeed, this book is worthy of a place on the same shelf with those other great biographies of the nineteenth century, M. l'Abbé Boucher's St. Theresa, M. de Montalembert's St. Elizabeth of Hungary, Père Lacordaire's St. Dominic, M. Chavin's St. Francis of Assisi, and the life of St. Francis de Sales by M. le Curé of St. Sulpice, Rev. M. Hamon.

J. P. T.

INSTITUTIONES PHILOSOPHICÆ. Ad normam doctrinæ Aristotelis et St. Thomæ Aquinatis studiosæ juventuti breviter propositæ a *Pio de Mandato*, Soc. Jesu, in Pont. Univ. Gregoriana Philosophiæ Professore. Volumen unicum. Romæ: Typographia Polyglotta. S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1894

THE many friends and admirers of Father de Mandato in the United States will learn with pleasure that he has given to the public in one volume a complete course in rational philosophy, beginning with logic and closing with natural theology, treating exhaustively ontology, cosmology and psychology.

Father de Mandato has for many years been professor of Philosophy in the Gregorian University at Rome, and this publication comes after a long experience which has taught him precisely what was needed in the way of a work on philosophy which might serve at once as a guide to both professor and student. He has treated his subject-matter with brevity and completeness. His theses are thoroughly examined and discussed, opposing opinions are studied, difficulties are explained and answered, the errors of modern philosophy—especially atomism and evolutionism—are confuted, and the immortal principles of Aristotle and St. Thomas are strictly adhered to, and their adaptability to the scientific progress made since their times is clearly vindicated. The brevity of the work does not in the least affect its clearness. The theses and questions, the difficulties and solutions are all arranged in such logical order that, while space has been saved, greater lucidity has resulted than is to be found in many a more voluminous work in which stronger effort has been made to explain everything down to the smallest detail.

Father de Mandato's work is truly philosophic both in matter and method. His care has been principally given to a clear and thorough exposition of the great fundamental principles and truths with which, if the student be once thoroughly imbued, he is always ready to follow out and explain their ramifications and consequences without taxing his memory with details and without possibility of error so long as he proceeds faithfully in the light of these truths. In every question the author rises to the loftiest considerations. Indeed, it is for the most part his practice to begin with the highest notions and, descending to particulars, to show how naturally and profoundly the general truth flows through and animates all the subordinates. Thus, for example, from the well-exposed concepts of actuality and potentiality he develops easily the complete theory with regard to the reception of formalities either substantial or accidental in their subjects, the theory of individuation of natures, the demonstration of the unity of form in all bodies which are truly individual, and especially in all living bodies. Likewise, in his treatment of the intellect and of intellectual operations, Father de Mandato is particularly fortunate in making the obstruse notions which, of necessity, enter into this matter intelligible, and has admirably traced the acquisition of our knowledge from its exterior causality to its interior perfection in the concepts of the spiritual intellect. He exhibits with scientific accuracy the intimate co-operation of the senses in the process of intellection and shows to a nicety just where the operation leaves the realm of materiality and becomes purely spiritual. The chasm between the material and the spiritual, which in the phenomenon of intellection is so evidently crossed, he bridges over by adhering strictly to the Aristotelian and Thomistic theory founded on the analogy so reasonably presumed between the working of the intellect and the material apprehensive faculties. The more accurate details which have been furnished us by the advance of scientific investigation with regard to the operation of the senses in the acquiring of knowledge

serve, in the hands of Father de Mandato, to confirm the teachings of the best scholastics concerning the origin of our ideas. The treatise on natural theology is not the least important part of the entire work. In it the learned professor has shown how conclusively a course of true philosophy founded on indisputable principles and developed under the guidance of a logical, unprejudiced, healthy reasoning, leads to the necessity of admitting the existence of one supreme, intelligent being, the Creator of all that exists outside his own essence, Himself uncreated, uncaused and, to a knowledge, imperfect, it is true, but still ennobling of many of the attributes of this perfect being.

Father de Mandato's work has already been adopted as a text-book in many European seminaries and institutes of learning, and its first edition is nearly exhausted. There is little doubt that the second edition will scarcely suffice to satisfy the demands which will be made from the United States. As a text-book none better could be selected. It stands, as it were, midway between the student and the professor, and supplies precisely what is needed for the one and for the other. The volume may be procured at the price of $2.00 from Benziger Brothers, New York, Chicago and Cincinnati, or from the Deposito di Libri, 120 Via del Seminario, Rome, Italy. F. Z. R.

St. Paul and His Missions. By the Abbe *Constant Fouard*. Translated with the author's sanction and co-operation by *Rev. George F. X. Griffith*. Small 8vo. pp. 432. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co.

This is the third work from the pen of the able professor of theology at Rouen on the history of early Christianity. The series was begun with "The Christ the Son of God" in two volumes, which contains the history of the founder of Christianity. Then followed a volume entitled "Saint Peter and the First Years of Christianity," which tells the story of the Church from the year 30 until the year 45; and now we have this volume on "Saint Paul and his Missions," which brings the history down to the year 62. At least one more volume is to come to complete the series. The books do really form a series, and the reader of one should have the others at hand, because the references are frequent.

The title of the present volume is slightly misleading, for it does not contain anything about St. Paul's birth, his early training, his life at Jerusalem, his conversion on the road to Damascus, and his labors in that city and in Tarsus. All this has been told in the preceding book on St. Peter, and this history begins with the choosing of Saul and Barnabas by the Holy Ghost for missionary work and their departure for Cyprus. We think that the account of St. Paul's early life in the history of St. Peter should have been very brief, and that it should have been given in detail in the present volume with reference from that book to this, rather than from this to that.

We are afraid that many readers will be very much disappointed when they reach the end of this history, to find that the great apostle is only entering Rome, and that all the interesting questions about the length of his stay there, the epistles that he wrote thence, his trial and acquittal, his fourth missionary journey, and his return and death, must remain unanswered until some future time, in some other book. We like the history of a man to begin with his birth and end with his death. A hundred volumes may be required to tell the story, provided we are informed of this fact before we procure the first volume; but we do not like to be told in the first chapter of the first volume that we must go

back to some other book for the story of his birth, nor to be informed in the last chapter of the last volume that we must look forward to some other book for the story of his death. And now we have done with fault finding.

The book, with the limitations we have mentioned, is admirable, admirable! Excepting Our Blessed Saviour, there is no one in all history whose life is so full of facts worthy of record as is the life of the great apostle of the Gentiles. Whether we consider it from the supposed year of his conversion in 36, until the supposed year of his death in 68; or give our attention only to his three missionary journeys and his voyage to Rome, occupying the years, probably, between 45 and 62, we have a record of travel and adventure equalled only in the imagination of the novelist. This story the Abbe Fouard tells with fullness, faithfulness, and power, following the hero through Palestine to Cyprus, through Asia Minor into Europe, and presenting with true artistic instinct the stirring scenes at Antioch of Pisidia, at Lystra, at Phillipi, at Thessalonica, at Corinth, at Athens, at Ephesus, and at Jerusalem. Any one of these missionary journeys would furnish abundant material for the most interesting story, and the most exciting drama; but the combination of them, so skillfully done, makes a book which fascinates the reader, and carries him to the end without pause. This book is worthy of attention, also, because it is the best life of St. Paul in English by a Catholic writer. We have had excellent lives of him before from the pens of Protestant writers, notably of Conybeare and Howson, to which Abbe Fouard frequently refers, and which we think is the best of all; but there has been no extensive life by a Catholic. This was very much needed, as one may easily understand by reading in the present volume the chapter on "Daily Life and Worship in the Primitive Churches," in which we catch a glimpse of the ancient belief in the doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist.

The references to authorities are very frequent and satisfactory, the chronological table is carefully made, the index is full and accurate, and the two maps on which the journeys of St. Paul are marked, are unusually good.

So well has the translator done his work, that he might claim to be the author.

Altogether, we can most truthfully say, here is a great work well done.

J. P. T.

A Life's Decision. By *T. W. Allies.* Second edition. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is, one of the most interesting books of its kind that we have ever read. Indeed, we think that it ranks second only to Cardinal Newman's "Apologia." Mr. Allies belonged to that interesting group of able thinkers and writers that played so important a part in the history of the Anglican Church during the forties, when the famous Tractarian movement shook it to its foundations, and drew from it some of its strongest supports. In that movement no one was more active than the author of this book, in which he tells of his progress through the various stages of study and controversy which finally brought him into the Catholic Church. In a former work entitled "Per Crucem ad Lucem," he put forward the reasons for this action in an abstract way; in the present instance he treats of them in a personal manner. Such treatment is by far more interesting, because the application of the principles

involved, to individuals, and the results of such application shown in their actions, convince us of their soundness more quickly and more firmly than does any amount of abstract reasoning. Indeed, the application of the principle in practice is the concrete proof of its abstract soundness.

The author tells us that his object in this book is "to trace the joint operation of grace and free-will, or the mode pursued by God from 1837 to 1850 in leading me out of heresy into the Church." During this period the author kept a diary in which he recorded the various stages of the conflict, and from these notes, he composed the present work in 1850, after he had entered the Catholic Church. In 1853 he laid the manuscript away in a drawer for the future instruction of his children, then in infancy. It lay in that drawer hidden and forgotten for twenty-five years, when it was seen by one of those children for whose sake it had been composed, and he, in 1880, persuaded his father to publish it.

Besides the various discussions of doctrines and practices, and the comparison of the Catholic and the Anglican churches in regard to their teachings on them, the book contains many interesting letters from such notable persons as Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Manning, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Coleridge, Bishop Wilberforce and others. It also tells of many interviews with distinguished persons, and records some very interesting estimates of character.

He describes a visit to Keble's house at Hunsley, and at the close of his stay draws this picture of him: "Confessor or martyr he was not made to be, but an ecclesiastical Walton, fishing by the side of quiet streams, and enjoying the lights and shadows as he dangled his trout at the end of his rod; no Athanasius as I had dreamed, but an Anglican parson." Here is a glimpse of another moving spirt of the times: "Marriott kicks and struggles against the effect of what he saw with me had their influence. I used to put questions to him just as they occurred to me, and he would answer in a pet, 'I cannot reply to such questions as that while I am putting on my gloves.' Poor soul! It was his first principle, that Pusey and Anglicanism *must* be right, and the more awkward the facts he had to deal with, the more he was troubled and put out."

In speaking of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Allies says: "Called on Pusey last Tuesday, and again yesterday, to set before him my difficulties. . . . . We conversed about an hour and a half on these." After speaking of the answers which he received from the famous Anglican, he concludes: "This may be considered a perfect specimen of Dr. Pusey's answer to theological difficulties. Is it any wonder that as soon as one was out of his presence all the doubts came back?" What a contrast between this description and that which he gives of Newman soon after his conversion. Speaking of a visit which he made to him at Littlemore, and of the conversation which they had on theological subjects, he closes, by saying: "It was a pleasure to see him again. One just feels that one would be content to do anything and go anywhere with him." At this time, it must be remembered, and for some time after, Mr. Allies was an Anglican clergyman.

The book abounds with these delightful glimpses and estimates of men of note, and with extracts from their correspondence. It is a book that one will take up for five minutes, and read for an hour. It is highly interesting and instructive, and it is an important contribution to this class of literature.

MEDITATIONS FOR ALL THE DAYS OF THE YEAR FOR PRIESTS, RELIGIOUS AND THE FAITHFUL. By *Rev. M. Hamon, S. S.*, Pastor of St. Sulpice, Paris. Translated from the Twenty-third Revised and Enlarged Edition by Mrs. Anne R. Bennett (*née* Gladstone). 5 vols., 16mo., cloth, gilt top. New York: Benziger Bros.

We might recommend this book without reservation, even if we had not seen it nor opened it. The author was one of the great men of the Church of France during the present century. He was a worthy son of that worthy father and founder of the Sulpicians, Rev. M. Olier; he was Superior of the Grand Seminary of Paris, and rector of one of its largest churches; and, from 1830 until 1874, he directed retreats for the clergy of twenty different dioceses. He was an eminent writer, some of his works being considered masterpieces. Bishop Dufanloup numbers his life of St. Francis de Sales among the excellent biographies of the nineteenth century, and Monseigneur Bougard, in the Preface to the second edition of his great life of St. Chantal, attributes the success of the first edition to the criticisms of M. Hamon and his companions, before whom the manuscripts were read for more than a year. In France, Father Hamon's history is known, and his work is so well appreciated that more than 92,000 copies of this book of meditations has been sold, and the twenty-third edition is now in the market.

We think we are justified in saying that we might recommend the book even if we had not seen it, nor opened it. But already America has added her approval of the work to that of France. Archbishops, bishops, and superiors of seminaries, and convents use the book, and recommend it to others.

Here it is before us; five medium-sized volumes, of about 425 pages each, bound in dark-blue cloth, with gilt tops, and enclosed in a blue cloth box especially made for them. One might expect to find in these volumes several meditations for each day, and meditations for the feasts of all the Saints. No; there is only one meditation for each day, and at the end of the volume the meditations on the principal saints. But let the author tell of his plan himself.

"In the composition of this work we have followed, step by step, if we can so say, the Roman liturgy, which has so admirably collected together the whole of religion within the course of the eclesiastical year, and under the direction of such a sure guide we have meditated: 1st, upon the mysteries which are the basis of Christian virtues; 2d, the Christian virtues themselves, which are the edifice to be built upon this basis; 3d, the feasts of the most celebrated among the saints, whose life is virtue itself in action; and we have endeavored to present here these great subjects in a manner which will be equally suitable to the clergy and the faithful, so that our work may be useful to a greater number." After warning us that he will place the same truth or virtue before us in different aspects, that he will accuse us many times of the same fault, and call upon us repeatedly to renew our resolutions, the author continues:

"It is very important, in order to succeed properly in meditation, to fix precisely the subject on the preceding evening, and to arrive at the meditation of it already penetrated with what is about to occupy us. Hence, at the head of every meditation we have placed: 1st, an indication of the points of meditation; 2d, the enunciation of the resolutions which should be the practical consequences of it. We have added, afterwards, what St. Francis de Sales calls a *spiritual nosegay*, that is to say, a good thought, which will be the sum total, as it were,

of the meditation, and of which the perfume, embalming our heart during the whole day, recalls to us our morning's meditation.

"We have also placed at the beginning of each volume the usual morning and evening prayers. Lastly, we have added to later editions: 1st, several new meditations; 2d, a more careful and complex index; 3d, a plan of meditation for an eight days' retreat; 4th, self-examinations inserted in the greater part of the meditations; 5th, various developments on several subjects of meditations."

Here is an author eminently qualified to do work of this kind; here is his purpose excellently mapped out, and clearly stated; here is the testimony of Catholic France assuring us that the work has been well done; and here is the book in an English dress for all who want to get nearer to God. J. P. T.

MANUALS OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGY: Outlines of Dogmatic Theology. By *Sylvester J. Hunter. S.J.* Longmans, Green & Co.: 1895. Roehampton, printed by James Stanley. Vol. i., pp. 525.

We welcome this first volume of a dogmatic theology in English from the pen of Father Hunter, S.J., late Rector of St. Beuno's College of Theology. His position as head of this house of theology for the Jesuits of England, and his antecedents as a barrister of distinction in London, would of themselves be a guarantee for both the solidity of matter and the clearness of style which mark the present volume. His works on law and equity, published before he became a Catholic, were adopted as university text-books. In his day he had carried off the honors of his *alma mater*, Trinity College, Cambridge.

Since he entered the Church some thirty-five years ago, his pen has been active, either in editing works under his own name or in contributing privately to the controversial questions of the day. At present he conducts one of the higher courses in the philosophical department for secular students at Stonyhurst College. Those manuals, called the Stonyhurst Series, of Philosophy, now so well known in America, have emanated from this faculty. It was projected some time ago to continue that philosophical series by completing it with a set of volumes on theology, equally substantial with the former, in excellent English, and satisfying a need which exists in doctrinal matters, for the benefit of higher students and cultured people generally.

Father Hunter says in his preface: "No attempt is made to give more than the merest outline of dogmatic theology; but it is hoped that it will satisfy the needs of some who are not professional students, especially by showing the nature of the questions dealt with in each treatise, and their proportionate importance as indicated by the space allowed to them."

This, we think, is just what is needed by such as, having received a sound religious education, desire to see all their religious knowledge put together as a compact whole, and the whole body of theology presented in a classical style of exposition. In the present volume, about one-third, more or less, of the entire theology of St. Thomas Aquinas is expounded, with the following treatises shown in their due sequence and dependence one upon another: The Christian Revelation, the Channel of Doctrine or Tradition, Holy Scripture, the Church, the Roman Pontiff, Faith. The other two volumes will treat the special subjects: God, the Trinity, Incarnation, Grace, the Sacraments, etc.

As to the controversial element in the author's manner of exposition,

he himself tells us that the principles, as laid down, will, he hopes, enable the reader to follow intelligently the course of any theological discussion in progress. And, as no question really stands by itself, it is apparent why he makes so much of seeing all the parts of theology linked together as a whole. We consider that this lucid and pleasing style is no slight adjunct to the proper setting of the matter.

Besides the advanced Catholic student and teachers in our educational institutions, others too, those who have inquiring minds outside of the Church, and prefer a consecutive explanation to a scholastic method, will find themselves admirably served here. The author connects his matter, when needful, with the previous treatises on philosophy in the Stonyhurst Series, and thereby dispenses himself from explaining over again what has fallen within the scope of his philosophical colleagues.

The consecutive numbering of sections, the changing head-lines which tell one at a glance where he is, the list of English books which may be consulted with profit, the little appendix on theological disputation in English, and—not the least commendation among the accidental qualifications of the work—the very satisfactory index at the end, all are in keeping with the accuracy and completeness visible throughout.

The type, style and printing which characterize the volumes of the Quarterly Series, appear again here, from the press of Mr. James Stanley, Roehamptom. On every ground we expect all success to attend the publication of this work in America, to the great profit of Catholic enlightenment. And we hope soon to see the remaining two volumes from the pen of this distinguished theologian.

Geschichte des Collegium Germanicum Hungaricum in Rom. Von *Cardinal Andreas Steinhuber, S.J.* Herder: Freiberg and St. Louis. Two volumes, octavo, pp. 472-560. Price, $5.00 net.

Well-deserved honors are accumulating upon the renowned German college in Rome, the oldest of those great Pontifical institutions by means of which Holy Church has gradually regained the position lost at the time of the revolt in the sixteenth century. At the last consistory, Father Steinhuber, who had directed the *Germanicum* for thirteen years, was raised to the dignity of the cardinalate; and he, in turn, sheds additional lustre upon the college by the publication of the two volumes before us which, in attractive style, narrate the story of his college from its slender beginnings to the present day. We cannot remember that any other college can boast of a cardinal as its annalist; but few of the great seminaries would contest with the *Germanicum* the right of being thus eminently honored. It is now nearly 350 years since that great *Alma Mater* of cardinals, bishops and distinguished scholars was founded by the saintly energy of the far-seeing Loyola; and it would be quite impossible to estimate the amount of good work which has been accomplished by its alumni throughout the Teutonic and Slavonic races. "The history of the *Collegium Germanicum Hungaricum*," says the author, "forms an important part of the history of that religious renovation, through which the Catholic Church in Germany and Hungary has gradually recovered from the debility and devastation caused by the disastrous apostacy of the Reformation, and has reawakened to new life. The college was the principal means chosen by Providence to stem the flood-tide of insurrection against the Church and to hold fast in the faith that portion of the German people which still adhered to the religion of the fathers. The manner of its foundation furnishes a new proof

of the ancient truth that Christ has built his Church on the Rock of Peter, and that the life and growth of the individual churches depend on their close connection with the centre of ecclesiastical unity."

It was the great legate Morone who, disheartened by the utter disruption of things in Germany and observing the paucity and unfitness of the native clergy, suggested to St. Ignatius the idea of founding a college in Rome, whither the most promising subjects might be sent and whence they might return to their homes well equipped with knowledge, piety and reverence for the Apostolic See. St. Ignatius took up the project with characteristic zeal, and overcoming obstacles which would have discouraged anyone else, at last opened the college on the 28th of October, 1552, with nineteen students. Then followed years of severe struggles. Sometimes it appeared that dissolution was inevitable. It was difficult to obtain fit subjects, for the road to Rome seemed long to the Germans. It was still more difficult to procure the wherewithal to support the institution. But God's blessing was upon the undertaking; and in 1573 the college was put on a solid footing by that immortal pontiff, Gregory XIII., who well merited the appellation of "father of all nations." From 1552 to 1894, according to Cardinal Steinhuber's computation, the *Germanicum* has educated 5748 students, of whom 675, or about one-eighth, have been Hungarians. During its 342 years of activity the college has given to the Church 28 cardinals, 47 archbishops (among them 5 electors and 21 primates), 280 bishops, besides a multitude of lesser dignitaries.

The eminent author has spared no pains to present the labors of the *Germaniker* in the different dioceses of their native land. The record is indeed a glorious one, of which the alumni may well be proud, and which should spur them on to emulate the zeal of their predecessors. When will some one of equal ability arise to discharge a similar debt for the great college of the Propaganda and for other world-renowned institutions? As the *Germanicum* was the oldest sister of the missionary colleges, which were all formed after her model, it is to be hoped that those who shall undertake to write the histories of the others will take Cardinal Steinhuber's work for their model and endeavor to imitate this admirable tribute to a great institution.

The Catholic University Bulletin. Vol. I., No. 1, January, 1895. Published quarterly by the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. Single numbers 50 cents. Annual subscription, $2.00.

The American Catholic Quarterly Review extends a hearty welcome to the "Bulletin" of our Catholic University. We regard it as a most valuable ally in the great combat of Catholic truth against error and unbelief in high places, a combat which (we hope we may say it without arrogance) our Review has for years maintained almost single-handed in these United States. "The new 'Bulletin,'" as the prospectus well says, "does not conflict with any other literary undertaking of American Catholics. The field of its labors is yet untouched, and it justly hopes to receive a welcome from all who desire to see the standard of study and research uplifted among us." This field of labor is defined in the most precise terms.

It will be the object of the "Bulletin," primarily, to serve as the organ and mouthpiece of the Catholic University, in order that the friends of higher education scattered over the vast area of our nation may have an accurate and detailed knowledge of the work of the Uni-

versity. It will "act as a hyphen between the academic corps on the one hand, and the world of American thought and action on the other." It will "be a means of communication with the great Catholic body and the scientific world in general, whereby the aim, the plans, the methods, the work, and the spirit of the university may be better and more widely appreciated."

As corollaries to this main purpose, it will "make known the work of the administration of the University, so far as it is of public interest, the material progress in the execution of the general plan, the benefactions, gifts, and other marks of good-will or sympathy which come to us. The methods of teaching will receive special attention, as well as the history and theories, old and new, of higher pedagogics in general." It will, moreover, duly chronicle the degrees given in the various faculties, the examinations, competitions, prizes, and relations with affiliated colleges and seminaries.

Special attention, it is promised, will be given to all important books issued, connected with the history of universities, academies, schools, and learned bodies. We venture to suggest to the able editorial staff that they construe this department of their work in the widest possible sense. Heretofore, Americans have gleaned but little profit from the enormous labors of European scholars, whose indefatigable researches in the archives of the Vatican, in London, Oxford, Paris, Vienna, and elsewhere, have revolutionized the story of the past. No one outside the quiet halls of a university, has either the means or the time requisite to catalogue the achievements of the numberless committees of different nations and provinces, that are working away, busy as ants or honey-bees, each individual bringing his little contribution to swell the grand aggregate. Though, to tell the truth, there is no aggregate at present. The field of knowledge has grown so vast, that it seems impossible for any one man or set of men to take a general survey of it. If, therefore, the American Catholics are not destined to remain hopelessly behind "in the existing keen competition of talents," it is of imperative necessity, not only that we have an able body of men, like the faculty of our University, whose duty it shall be to keep a sharp eye upon the progress made in the learned world, but who shall also be prompt in communicating their knowledge to those who have not the leisure to bestow upon these important subjects.

There is plenty of room, then, for the "Catholic University Bulletin." It has a great and peculiar mission; and, we may add, its advent is welcomed by none so cordially, its importance is appreciated by none so keenly, as by the editorial staff of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW. We augur it, therefore, a long, brilliant, and prosperous career.

CURSUS PHILOSOPHICUS IN USUM SCHOLARUM AUCTORIBUS PLURIBUS PROFESSORIBUS IN COLLEGIO EXÆTENSI ET STONYHURSTENSI, S. J. Psychologia Rationalis, Auctore *Bern. Bœdder, S. J.* Friburgi. Herder. St. Louis, Mo. 1894. Pp. xvii. 344. Pr. $1.25.

This volume on psychology is the fifth to appear in the course of philosophy now being prepared for the use of schools (in the higher and probably highest sense of the term) by the German Jesuits. The four preceding volumes on logic, ontology, cosmology (natural philosophy) and ethics have been already noticed in these pages. Only one volume more remains to be published in order to complete the series, that on theodicy.

What was said in the notice of its predecessors may be said with equal truth of the present volume. It is a model text-book, and this both as to matter and form. Its range of material is as complete as can be mastered by students who have not already made advanced studies in pyschology. And the subject is presented with such admirable method, with such attractive typographical aids to the eye and memory that the most exacting critic could hardly find anything more to demand in a book intended for class purposes. There are those probably who will object to the length of these manuals, and there will doubtless be a demand for a compendium of them all. Many however will prefer their comparative fulness of material to the opposite scantiness and will expect the professor of philosophy to form a compendium, if he need it to suit his individual purposes.

We are pleased to find in this manual of psychology a greater regard for the wants of the English speaking student than is shown by the preceding portions of the course. This is doubtless owing to the fact that its author has for some time been associated with Stonyhurst, England, whence also he issued his volume on natural theology, which forms one of the series of philosophical manuals in English emanating from that institution.

Father Bœdder's aim has been to make his work both solid and timely. Accordingly he establishes thoroughly the fundamental truths of psychology, but passing by with lighter touch such as have but a general bearing on the main subject-matter, he dwells with special care on such as are essential for the student, in order to escape and refute the gravest philosophical errors of our day. This judicious discrimination is evidenced in many theses. For instance, in the very first, where he combats the materialism of Vogt, Büchner, Hæckel by demonstrating the necessity of a radical substantial non-material principle in order to account for the act of sensation, especially in the case of man. The same may be said of the twelfth, in which is proven against the same class of adversaries, the super-organic nature of the human intellect; likewise of the next, wherein the capability of the intellect's transcending sensile phenomena is established against positivism, but most especial of the set of theses (33–38) bearing on the nature of the will and the fact and range of liberty.

Then, too, special pains have been taken to bring out into stronger light and more fully a number of propositions not unfrequently left scantily in the twilight. Instances of this might be cited from the treatment of the question, how the faculties are related to the essence of the soul (Th. 39) and that regarding the relation of the soul to the body. (47–49.)

We recommend the volume as one of the most solid and on the whole most timely, and, in proportion to its range, most thorough Latin manuals of psychology that we know of. Pervaded throughout by the teaching and spirit of St. Thomas and the neo-scholastics, it molds its subject-matter in a way admirably fitted for disciplining and informing the mind as to the bearings of a true psychology on what passes for the philosophy of to-day. F. P. S.

Lehre des Joannes Cassianus. Von Natur und Gnade. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Gnadenstreits im 5. Jahrhundert. Von *Dr. Alexander Hoch.* Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder. 8vo. Pp. 119. Price 70 cents, net.

How so saintly a man as Cassian, who had enjoyed the instruction of St. Chrysostom and the other great masters of the spiritual life, who had,

moreover, taken a resolute stand against Pelagianism at the first appearance of the heresy, could have fallen into suspicion of error on the subject of divine grace, has always been a mystery to his contemporaries and to posterity. Was he really a semi-Pelagian, or was he simply misinterpreted? This is the problem which Dr. Hock undertakes to solve in the able monograph before us. After a careful examination of all the evidence attainable, he sums up as follows:

"We have endeavored, with the aid of Cassian's own utterances, to attain a comprehensive view of his manner of thought and expression regarding grace and free-will. Our conclusion is, that our author had little intention of fixing the mutual relation with dogmatic accuracy and definiteness; he is, throughout, engrossed by practical and moral considerations. According to the immediate purpose and exigency of his ascetic treatises does he lay special emphasis, now on the divine and again on the human agency in the affairs of salvation; and he therein shows his obligation to and mental affinity with St. Chrysostom. He has insisted on the necessity of grace for the work of salvation in all its phases; he has, furthermore, drawn a formal distinction between the divine and the human operation in the process of justification. In other words, he denies, on the principle of inherited sinfulness, that grace and free-will are of equal value.

"In his emphasizing the free moral endowment of man as against predestinationism and grace, his opposition to St. Augustine is apparent; whilst his anti-Pelagian tendency is seen in his assertion of the absolute necessity of grace. As to the central question, in what manner grace and free-will co-operate in the formation of good resolutions and actions, Cassian's expressions do not seem to be wholly consistent. A considerable number of passages speak of the absolute necessity of grace at the beginning of each good act of the will, whilst others attribute at least the effort, or attempt, or desire, or aspiration to man's moral endowment. That in handling this question Cassian betrays a certain amount of unsteadiness, cannot be gainsaid. The explanation of this is found, partly in the nature of the subject itself, which, as the history of the dogma to our own day evinces, presents various phases, and partly in the author's mode of treating it, which was anything but systematic and speculative. Cassian was far from wishing to minimize the just prerogative of grace, but neither did he wish to trench upon the freedom of the will, as is clear from his summary of his views at the end of the thirteenth Collation."

It seems to us that the author's view would be still more satisfactory if he emphasized the fact that Cassian's exhortations were addressed to an entirely different audience from St. Augustine's. The great Bishop of Hippo was forced into a polemical position which necessitated his insisting upon the power of divine grace to the obscuring of the human element. An ascetical writer like Cassian, taking for granted what every Catholic is well aware of, that grace is paramount, necessarily devotes his energies to arousing fallen mankind from lethargy by persuading them that their fate is in their own hands. It was unfortunate for Cassian that he felt called upon to point out the consequences which, illogically of course, might flow from St. Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings, but as a matter of fact those consequences have been drawn, and must be in every generation vigorously repudiated.

THE FORMATION OF CHRISTENDOM. By *T. W. Allies*. Popular edition. Vol. I. The Christian Faith and the Individual. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

When this book was reviewed in the QUARTERLY of 1876, the reviewer closed with these words: "We wish Mr. Allies's work were in the hands of every priest and educated lay Catholic because, apart from other considerations, it shows clearly that the prevailing sceptical philosophy of to-day, in all its phases and sects, is nothing more than a revamping of ancient Pagan philosophic ideas, which, years ago, were weighed in the balance and found utterly wanting, even when tested by their own professed aims, and whose last word and final result, as a distinguished writer has well said, was despair."

This wish was not gratified, and one of the reasons was because the book was too costly. Now, however, this objection has been removed, for the present popular edition is published at a figure that places it within the reach of every one. The work has lost none of its excellence with the lapse of years. It presents the same faithful pictures of Roman civilization compared with the civilization of others, Antioch and Alexandria, bringing forward such witnesses as St. John and St. Paul, and summoning St. Augustine to testify to the moral and political results of such civilization.

Then comes the transition to Christian civilization. The comparison between the heathen and Christian man illustrates in a striking manner the effects of the two civilizations, and brings out clearly the excellence of the latter over the former. The two chapters on the married life and on the virgin life are particularly excellent, summarizing, as they do, the elevation of man and woman to the places which God intended them to occupy, and from which they had been dragged down by paganism. The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster says of this work: "It is one of the noblest historical works I have ever read. . . . . We have nothing like it in the English language. . . . . No English work that I know exhibits the mission of the Church to the world—to the pagan world, to the civilized world, and, I might add, to the modern world, which is both pagan and civilized in marked degrees—in a more eloquent, more fascinating, or more convincing manner." This is unstinted praise indeed, and we feel that we can add nothing to it but to say that we cheerfully indorse it.

BOOKS AND READING. By *Brother Azarias*. Fourth edition, enlarged. New York: Cathedral Library Association, 123 East Fiftieth Street.

Some time before his death, Brother Azarias gave a lecture to the members of the Cathedral Library Association on the subject, "Books and Reading." He was afterwards requested to publish it, and after revision and development, it appeared in book form. Its reception was so general, that a second and a third edition were called for, and yet the demand was not satisfied. Now we have before us the fourth edition, printed on larger, heavier paper, with several additions to the text, and bound quite prettily in green and white cloth. We object to a white cover for a book that is to be handled and read. It is soiled so quickly that the owner's feelings in regard to it, if he be a person of any taste and refinement, are like the feelings of a lady mother when she sees the smeared face of her child. If the book were bound entirely in green or brown cloth, we are sure it would feel better satisfied itself. The new paper is most commendable, the wide margin is a virtue, the gilt top

and untrimmed edges, all appeal to the book lover. The additions to the text are a chapter on Dante, and chapters on George Eliot, Kathleen O'Meara, Mr. Augustine Bissell, and Tennyson's Workshop.

In the beginning of the volume there is a Memoir of Brother Azarias by Dr. John A. Mooney. Former editions contained an index; it has been omitted from this edition, and we do not know why. The book should have both an index and a table of contents, so that the reader may find chapters and sections of chapters without having to search through the whole volume. We recommend this book to all readers, but especially to members of reading circles. They could not have a better text-book. Brother Azarias was a scholar and a philosopher. He is very reliable, and we were surprised when we read his statement that George Eliot had translated "Renan's Life of Jesus;" she translated the equally worthless Strauss' "Life of Christ."

A CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, Prepared and Enjoined by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, to which has been added a Vocabulary, alphabetically arranged, giving the definitions of all the words in the book, including the words of the prayers. By *Rev. James P. Turner* of Philadelphia. Publisher: John Joseph McVey, 39 N. 13th St., Phila.

Many editions of the Baltimore Catechism have been published with definitions of *some* of the words. Sometimes these definitions have been placed at the beginning of the chapter, sometimes at the end, and sometimes at the foot of the page. This is the first time, however, that all the words have been defined, and that the definitions have been arranged alphabetically in one place. As the editor rightly claims, a selection of words for defining cannot be so well made as to suit all needs, and therefore it is better to define all words. Again, when the definitions are given at the beginning or end of the chapter, or at the foot of the page, they cannot be referred to again, although the words may occur again in the text, and hence it is better to arrange the definitions alphabetically in one place. If the words of this catechism should be defined at all, and every one admits that they should, Father Turner seems to have adopted the best method of doing the work. Of course, it is impossible to define words so simply and so plainly as to suit all capacities, but we can safely say that the definitions in this instance are the simplest and clearest that we have seen. In many instances they are more than definitions—they are sketches of persons, descriptions of places, and explanations of feasts and ceremonies. We recommend the book to all who are engaged in studying or teaching the catechism.

THE WATCHES OF THE SACRED PASSION, WITH BEFORE AND AFTER. By *Father P. Gallway, S. J.* Three volumes, 12mo., pp. 525. London: Art and Book Company.

Beginning with the raising of Lazarus from the dead, and ending with the ascension of Christ into heaven, the author in these three volumes treats the life of Our Saviour during that period with a fullness of detail that we have not seen equalled. Persons, places, things, customs, dress, language, times, everything that the most exacting student may wish to know, he can learn here. All disputed questions are discussed from every point of view, and sufficient reasons are given for each conclusion.

The quotations from the Sacred Scriptures and from the Fathers are well nigh exhaustless, and the manner in which the author presents each scene of the Passion, compels the reader to be a witness. The sugges-

tions for reflection are so skilfully made that one hardly realizes that they are suggestions.

This is a book for students and teachers. It is a book especially for priests.

The book is published in two forms. We must warn our readers not to buy the cheaper edition. It is but a trifle cheaper than the other, but it is printed on such mean paper that it is a disgrace to the *Art* and Book Company of London. The paper is so thin and transparent that the text can be read through it. The consequent confusion of the text of one page with that of the other, and the strain on the eyes of the reader, is deplorable. The publishers should withdraw every copy of the cheaper edition from the market and destroy it.

A Retreat Consisting of Thirty-three Discourses with Meditations, for the Use of the Clergy, Religious and others. By the *Right Reverend John Cuthbert Hedley, O. S. B.* Bishop of Newport and Meneria. 12mo., pp. 425. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"These Discourses or Meditations are intended to furnish matter for a Retreat of eight or ten days. Each of them consists of devout considerations, followed by points for mental prayer. . . . . Each discourse, with its affections, is calculated to afford matter for about an hour's exercise."

This book is really what it pretends to be—a series of thirty-three discourses on the principal truths of religion, and on the principal duties of a priest, with brief points in most instances after each discourse, for meditation. The author writes in an unusually clear, attractive, logical manner, and the reader is not repelled by the unnecessarily severe, and even repulsive, manner which too often characterizes books of this kind. The soul, and particularly the sinful soul, should never be shocked and repelled by the truth, but the light should be let in so skillfully as to move and convince. This is Bishop Hedley's way, and his book will do much good, whether it be used as a companion and guide during a retreat, or as a book of daily meditation.

The book is exceptionally well made, and is a credit to the publishers. The paper, the type, the binding—all are in the best taste, and it is a pleasure to be able to say this, for the opportunity does not often present itself.

Christliche Ikonographie. Ein Handbuch zum Verständniss der Christlichen Kunst. Von *Heinrich Detzel.* Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, $2.75 net.

This is the first volume of what promises to be an excellent and exhaustive treatise on Christian art. The author takes his stand upon the true scientific principle that since Christian art is the direct offspring of Christian dogma, it follows that the artist who undertakes to represent sacred things to the eye must be thoroughly imbued with Christian doctrine and especially with a complete knowledge of Christian traditions. Instead of stringing together in alphabetical order, as has often been done, a list of saints with accompanying symbols, he takes up the different themes which have engaged the industry of artists, and beginning with the earliest extant representations, follows the development of the subject to classical and modern times. In the present volume he discusses the pictorial presentations of the Deity, of the Virgin Mother of Christ, of good and evil spirits and of the divine Mysteries. The book is adorned

with 220 beautiful illustrations, and is highly creditable alike to the author and to the publisher. Would that every one who aspires to be an exponent of Catholic artistic principles would begin by a thorough study of this excellent work.

THE CURÉ OF ARS. By *Kathleen O'Meara*. Reprinted from the Ave Maria, Notre Dame, Ind.

How encouraging this life is for poor struggling sinners. We are told that only saints enter heaven, and in the midst of our struggles we are sometimes tempted to think that no one can be a saint in this age. But in the "Curé of Ars," we have a real modern saint, for although he has not been formally canonized, no one questions his claim to that distinction. Born in the little village of Dardilly, in the suburbs of Lyons, in 1786, and dying in the village of Ars, August 3, 1859, he may with truth be called a modern saint. The late gifted authoress tells the story of his simple yet holy life so charmingly, that the reader who begins the book will not stop until he has finished it. About 200 pages of a 12mo. tell the story, but it is very nourishing, and we recommend it without hesitation to every one.

WETZER UND WELTE'S KIRCHENLEXICON. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Fünfundneunzigstes Heft.

The publication of this excellent Catholic lexicon is progressing, steadily, indeed, but not rapidly enough to satisfy the impatience of the myriads of Catholics in all parts of Christendom who look to it for accurate and varied information in all departments of Christian lore. The 95th number lies before us, carrying down the revised edition to the word *Pantheism*. Among other valuable articles there is one by Kellner on the timely subject of *Pædagogik*.

LEBEN UNSERES HERRN JESUS CHRISTUS. Von *E. L. Camus*, aus dem Französischen übersetzt von E. Keppler. II. Band. Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder. 8vo. pp. 599. Price, $2.25, net.

This second volume of the German translation of the Life of Our Lord by Le Camus, continues the narrative from the departure from Galilee until the end. It is, we believe, the best adapted of all the lives of Our Saviour to satisfy the spiritual needs of the people. The book is excellently printed, and contains a copious index, and a good map of Jerusalem and Bethelhem borrowed from the atlas of the Bible by Riess.

DAS PROBLEM DES LEIDENS IN DER MORAL. Eine akademische Antrittsrede von *Dr. Paul Keppler, O.O.*, Professor der Moraltheologie an der Theologischen Facultät in Freiburg. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Pp. 58. Price 50 cents, net.

An eloquent little dissertation on the ethics of suffering, in which it is demonstrated that Catholic ethics alone can grapple bravely with the mysterious problem of a suffering humanity, and present the only satisfactory solution. We should be much pleased to see the address translated and scattered broadcast among the people.

SHORT INSTRUCTIONS IN THE ART OF SINGING PLAIN CHANT. Designed for the use of Catholic choirs and schools, by *J. Singenberger*. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.

We are pleased to welcome the fourth and enlarged edition of this valuable little work. If our pastors would only become acquainted with its merits, they would place a copy of it in the hands of each of the singers in their choirs and of the children in their schools. Plain chant is as easy to learn as it is important.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

MAGISTER CHORALIS. A Theoretical and Practical Manual of Gregorian Chant for the use of the Clergy, Seminarists, Organists, Choir-masters, Choristers, etc. By *Rev. Dr. F. X. Haberl.* Second (English) edition, from ninth German edition, by *Most Rev. Dr. Donnelly*, Bishop of Canea. Ratisbon, New York and Cincinnati: Frederick Pustet. Price 90 cents.

A MANUAL OF SCRIPTURE HISTORY; being an Analysis of the Historical Books of the Old Testament. By the *Rev. Walter J. B. Richards, D.D.*, Oblate of St. Charles; Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Westminster. Sixth edition. London: Burns & Oates, limited. New York: Benziger Brothers.

COMPENDIUM SACRÆ LITURGIÆ JUXTA RITUM ROMANUM: una cum Appendice de Jure Ecclesiastico particulari in America Fœderata Sept. vigente. Scripsit *P. Innocentius Wapelhorst, O.S.F.* Editio quinta emendatior. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LETTERS OF ST. ALPHONSUS MARIA DE LIGUORI, Doctor of the Church. Translated from the Italian. Edited by *Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.S.S.R.* Part I. General Correspondence. Vol. II. New York: Benziger Brothers.

HYGIENE, WITH ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY; being an amplification of Edward's Catechism of Hygiene. By *Joseph F. Edwards, A.M., M.D.* Catholic School Book Co., 28 Barclay Street, New York.

JOURNALS KEPT DURING TIMES OF RETREAT. By *Father John Morris, S.J.* Selected and edited by *Father J. H. Polen, S.J.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

FROM THE GREEKS TO DARWIN; an outline of the development of the Evolution Idea. By *Henry Fairfield Osburn, S.D.* New York: Macmillan & Co. Price $2.00.

CEREMONIES OF SOME ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS. By *Rev. Daniel O'Loan*, Dean, Maynooth College. Sixth edition. Dublin: Browne & Nolan. Price Six shillings.

SACERDOTIS VADE MECUM; seu Rubricæ Generales Missalis Romani in commodiorem Celebrantium usum. *Revdi. J. L. Andreis*, cura. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.

BERNADETTE OF LOURDES. A mystery. By *E. Pouvillon.* Translated by *Henry Osbee.* London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

OFFICIUM PARVUM BEATÆ MARIÆ VIRGINIS. Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary and Office of the Dead. Chicago: Miehlbauer & Berhle.

THE SACRED SCRIPTURES, OR THE WRITTEN WORD OF GOD. By *Rev. Wm. Humphrey, S.J.* New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE ONE MEDIATOR, OR SACRIFICE AND SACRAMENTS. By *Rev. Wm. Humphrey, S.J.* New York: Benziger Brothers.

70152

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM